OCT 5 1982 1011-B Y4.F76/1:G86

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD GRENADA

COMPLETED

ORIGINAL

103

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JUNE 15, 1982

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
96-793 O WASHINGTON : 1982

I

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

L. H. FOUNTAIN, North Carolina
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York
LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, New York
GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
DON BONKER, Washington
GERRY E. STUDDS, Massachusetts
ANDY IRELAND, Florida
DAN MICA, Florida
MICHAEL D. BARNES, Maryland
HOWARD WOLPE, Michigan
GEO. W. CROCKETT, Jr., Michigan
BOB SHAMANSKY, Ohio
SAM GEJDENSON, Connecticut
MERVYN M. DYMALLY, California
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio
TOM LANTOS, California
DAVID R. BOWEN, Mississippi

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Michigan
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois
LARRY WINN, Jr., Kansas
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO, California
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
JOEL PRITCHARD, Washington
MILLICENT FENWICK, New Jersey
ROBERT K. DORNAN, California
JIM LEACH, Iowa
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
TOBY ROTH, Wisconsin
OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine
JOHN LeBOUTILLIER, New York
HENRY J. HYDE, Illinois

John J. Brady, Jr., *Chief of Staff*
Nancy A. Agris, *Staff Assistant*

Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs

MICHAEL D. BARNES, Maryland, *Chairman*

GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania
GERRY E. STUDDS, Massachusetts
DAN MICA, Florida
SAM GEJDENSON, Connecticut

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO, California
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
ROBERT K. DORNAN, California

Victor C. Johnson, *Subcommittee Staff Director*
J. Edward Fox, *Minority Staff Consultant*
Robert Kurz, *Subcommittee Staff Associate*
Lillian Pubillones, *Subcommittee Staff Associate*

CONTENTS

WITNESSES

Page

Hon. Mervyn M. Dymally, a Representative in Congress from the State of California 2

Hon. Geo. W. Crockett, Jr., a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan 11

Stephen W. Bosworth, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs 27

Hon. Sally A. Shelton, former U.S. Ambassador to the Eastern Caribbean 55

Randall Robinson, executive director, TransAfrica 77

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Memorandum to Hon. Clement J. Zablocki, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs from Hon. Geo. W. Crockett, Jr., regarding official mission to Grenada dated May 24, 1982 4

Statement of Hon. Ronald V. Dellums, a Representative in Congress from the State of California 15

Statement of the U.S.-Grenada Friendship Society 22

APPENDIXES

1. Letter to Subcommittee Chairman Michael D. Barnes from Representative William F. Goodling, relating comments of a constituent on Grenada 99
2. Letter and statement of the National Conference of Black Lawyers 100

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD GRENADA

TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 1982

House of Representatives,
Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 2:05 p.m., in room 2200, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Michael D. Barnes (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. **Barnes**. The Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs will come to order.

The purpose of this hearing is to analyze economic and political conditions in Grenada, U.S. policy toward that country, and policy alternatives.

We are holding this hearing, quite frankly, principally at the request of our colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus, two of whose members will be leading off our testimony this afternoon.

I think it is an important and timely hearing. If the United States has a policy toward Grenada, it appears to consist of not answering Grenadian mail and avoiding being seen in the same room with officials from Grenada. This posture obviously has important practical consequences.

The determination which has apparently been made by the Secretary of State, that Grenada is to be excluded on political grounds from all benefits under the Caribbean Basin initiative, threatens the entire Caribbean package because it will cost us the vote of members who would ordinarily favor the program, but oppose the intrusion of these kinds of political criteria.

I don't know what our policy toward Grenada should be, but I do think that we ought to have one. If Grenada really threatens our security, obviously we should take intelligent steps to counter that. But closing off all communication is not very intelligent in my judgment. Letting our hostility toward Grenada drive our entire Caribbean policy isn't very smart either.

So in this hearing, we are going to try to define what the situation in Grenada is, where U.S. interests lie, and how we should pursue those interests. The first witnesses who will help us consider these issues will be our colleagues, the Honorable Mervyn M. Dymally and the Honorable George W. Crockett.

Gentlemen, we certainly welcome you to the subcommittee this afternoon and look forward to hearing your testimony. I would like to recognize my friend, and our distinguished colleague from California, the Honorable Mervyn M. Dymally. Merv, welcome to the subcommittee.

STATEMENT OF HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. **Dymally**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I thank you, and the Congressional Black Caucus thanks you for holding these hearings.

Mr. Chairman, my views on U.S. policy toward Grenada have been expressed before this committee previously, and I will only summarize those views this afternoon.

UNITED STATES POLICY OF ISOLATION TOWARD GRENADA

The decision of this subcommittee to hold these hearings, I might say, is a welcome departure from the State Department's campaign to pretend that Grenada does not exist. I hasten to add that Grenada is not a nation of saints, but sainthood, to my knowledge, is not a criterion of our relations with other countries.

The State Department has in the past raised three issues concerning Grenada to justify its position: One, the lack of a free press; two, the detention of political prisoners; and three, the absence of free elections.

If it is true that Grenada has no free press—neither does the Soviet Union. If Grenada has political prisoners, so, too, does South Africa. If Grenada does not have free elections, the same may be said of China. With each of these other three countries, however, the United States is actively pursuing discussions, if not maintaining formal diplomatic relations.

If there is any one country with which the United States should not be dealing, it is South Africa. Yet, this administration is pursuing relations with this nation with the highest degree of intensity.

If we disapprove of any conditions in Grenada, we ought to at least understand what accounts for them. But we are ill-positioned to understand if we refuse to even talk with each other.

On my own visit to Grenada, I questioned the Prime Minister about these three issues raised by the State Department. I am sure the Ambassador to the OAS, Ms. Dessima Williams, would be more than happy to respond in detail, but I would like to relate the responses the Prime Minister gave me.

RESTRICTION OF FREEDOMS

The restrictions on the press, he said, was the result of the opposition media being foreign-owned or manipulated by outside interests. The concern was that efforts were being made to subvert the Government as was done in Chile under President Allende.

The political prisoners, most of whom I understand have now been released, were for the most part members of the Mongoose Gang, the repressive police force of the previous Prime Minister.

As for the lack of free elections, the concern was to solidify a base in order to prevent outside interests from disrupting constructive efforts to build the country.

From the perspective of a Third World nation, with its particular problems and historical circumstances, the rationale is understandable. But even assuming that there is some validity in the criticisms of the State Department, as judged by U.S. standards, they are not sufficient grounds, in my judgment, for refusing to enter into discussions with Grenada.

I might add, last year when the Foreign Minister was here, I personally called Mr. Enders and asked him to speak with the Foreign Minister. He refused, of course, and I said, "Common decency dictates that at least you assign someone from the Department of State to talk with this gentleman."

I know of no other country toward which the United States has such ambivalence, especially one so small and so eager to deal with us as Grenada. If perfection is to be our sole criterion for dealing with other nations, then I am afraid the United States will soon find itself dealing with no one at all. The behavior of the State Department in this instance, in my estimation, is best described as petty, arbitrary, discriminatory, outrageous, and absurd.

One additional issue that ought to be raised is that of the U.S. intervention in attempting to block the building of Grenada's airport. I will not dwell on that matter except to request that Congressman Crockett's report on the issue be entered into the record as well as Congressman Dellum's forthcoming report to the Armed Services Committee based on his recent official trip to Grenada to inspect the airport in person.[1]

[The material referred to follows:]

---

[1] The report by Representative Ron Dellums is available from the House Armed Services Committee document room.

COMMITTEES:
FOREIGN AFFAIRS
SUBCOMMITTEES:
AFRICA
INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS
SMALL BUSINESS
SUBCOMMITTEES:
EXPORT OPPORTUNITIES AND
SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS
PROBLEMS
GENERAL OVERSIGHT
SELECT COMMITTEE
ON AGING
SUBCOMMITTEES:
HOUSING AND CONSUMER INTERESTS
HUMAN SERVICES
DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBER
CONGRESSIONAL BLACK
CAUCUS

GEO. W. CROCKETT, JR.
13TH DISTRICT, MICHIGAN

Congreſs of the United States
House of Representatives

PLEASE REPLY TO
☐ WASHINGTON OFFICE.
1531 LONGWORTH BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515
(202) 225-2261
CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE
CENTERS:
☐ 8401 WOODWARD AVENUE
(GREAT LAKES BUILDING)
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48202
(313) 874-4900
☐ 2966 EAST GRAND BOULEVARD
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48202
(313) 875-4225

May 24, 1982

MAY 27 '82
WASHINGTON OFFICE
MICHAEL D BARNES

TO: Honorable Clement Zablocki, Chairman
Committee on Foreign Affairs

FROM: Geo. W. Crockett, Jr.
Member, Committee on Foreign Affairs

SUBJ: Overseas Travel - Grenada

The following is submitted as my written report to the Committee regarding travel, on Committee business, to Grenada from March 12 through March 15, 1982.

Congressman Conyers from the Committee on the Judiciary and I arrived in Grenada on the afternoon of March 12, 1982. We were met at the airport by the Minister of Justice, Honorable Kendrick Radix. The purpose of our visit was to attend, as guests of the Government, the celebration of the Third Anniversary of the People's Revolution in Grenada.

Background

Grenada is a small island of 110,000 people located in the Eastern Caribbean. Its inhabitants are mainly of African descent (84% Black, 11% mixed, 3% East Indian, and 1% other).

On March 13, 1979 the current government of Grenada (People's Revolutionary Government, or PRG) took power in a bloodless coup and ousted former Prime Minister Eric Gairy. The People's Revolutionary Government (PRG) subsequently replaced the deposed Gairy with the present Prime Minister of Grenada, Maurice Bishop. The government under Prime Minister Bishop is composed of various ministeries filled by members of the New Jewel Movement (Joint Endeavor for Welfare, Education and Liberation).

The 1979 coup appears to have been precipitated by the massive corruption of the Gairy administration. Popular sentiment among the island's inhabitants indicates to me that the present government of Prime Minister Bishop is succeeding to a significant degree in eliminating graft and corruption. Moreover, the PRG government appears to have a wide base of popular support among the citizenry, over one-half of whom attended or otherwise participated in the Independence Day Rally.

Activities

Saturday, March 13, was the concluding day of the week-long celebration. It featured a large, outdoor rally attended by the diplomatic corps, all government officials and distinguished guests. Our entire day was spent in attendance at the rally and other official functions. Our formal introduction was enthusiastically received.

Sunday, March 14, was taken up, in the main, by meetings with the Prime Minister, Honorable Maurice Bishop, the Foreign Minister, Honorable Unison Whiteman, and the Minister of Justice. Earlier in the day, the Foreign Minister had accompanied us on a visit to the site of the new airport and had given us an explanation of the progress of the work.

I departed Grenada on Monday morning, but Congressman Conyers remained for discussions with the Chief Justice concerning Grenada's judicial system.

Saturday's rally, which was a festive affair with an overwhelming attendance of people who had arrived mainly on foot, featured an extended report by the Prime Minister concerning the accomplishments of the People's Revolutionary Government (PRG) during the preceeding year.

Progress of the Revolution

The new government has established economic development as its first priority, with economic independence as the goal.

Nineteen-hundred and eighty-two, for example, has been named the "Year of Economic Construction." The populace is urged to "Work to Build Grenada" by countless billboards and posters. Grenada's economy has traditionally been dependent on agricultural exports, particularly bananas and spices, and on tourism. In an effort to retain the income from food processing within the island, the government is attempting to develop agricultural industries. As part of this program, a million dollar fruit processing plant was recently opened. (According to the PRG, much fruit, such as mangoes, had previously gone to waste for lack of any processing facility.) Products from this facility are exported under the trade name "Spice Isle". The government also started operation of a National Fisheries Corporation, with six boats donated from Cuba.

The economic development program has also included efforts to better provide services to the people of the island. Education fees have been abolished, and free medical care is available. A system of frequent and free bus transportation has increased the mobility of the populace. The number of scholarships has doubled and free secondary education is being provided to all students. Additionally, the Center for Popular Education has succeeded in reducing illiteracy by forty-nine (49) percent.

With regard to health services, there are now seven (as compared to a pre-revolutionary high of one) dental clinics; and there are now thrity-seven (37) doctors as compared to a previous level of seventeen (17). Also, a new eye hospital and x-ray center have been opened and a primary health care system is being implemented in the villages throughout the island.

Despite the government's efforts, however, the economy remains in difficulty, primarily due to the depressed world prices for fruits and spices. Tourism has also suffered as a result of the recession, and in the aftermath of the revolution. (The PRG has not discouraged tourists; however, the U.S. State Department discourages travel to the island because of its alleged Cuban ties.)

Observations Regarding U.S.-Grenada Relations

Although neither the representatives of the PRG nor the citizens of Grenada expressed any hostility toward American citizens, there was considerable animosity toward the U.S. Government. This was evidenced by repeated anti-American rhetoric during public speeches.

The Airport Issue

The PRG cites a number of factors as evidence of unfair treatment by the U.S. Government. The most oft repeated, however, are the unsuccessful efforts by this country to prevent or reduce international funding of the new airport.

In order to further tourism, the PRG is building an international airport capable, with a runway of 9,000 feet, of handling jumbo jets.

The State Department has labeled the airport "economically dubious" and has expressed concern regarding possible military uses. The PRG notes, however, that the airport is smaller than that of Barbados (Grantley Adams International Airport--11,000 feet) and that Grenada has a tourist potential (not yet achieved) equal to that of Barbados.

The principal contractor for the airport is an American firm. When completed, the runway will be the same length as those on the neighboring islands of St. Vincent and Trinidad and will permit Grenada to compete for non-stop American and European tourist trade.

The financing for the airport has been supplied by the following international sources:

Libya	$4 million
Syria	$2 million
Algeria	$6 million
OPEC	$2 million
EEC	$4 million
Cuba	$33.6 million (in equipment and personnel only)
ECGD	$12 million
Venezuela	$4 million
Govt. of Grenada	$7 million

The completion of the building of an airport capable of handling international air traffic is crucial to the growth of Grenada's tourist industry, which is the country's major foreign exchange earner. Presently, the government has not realized its potential earnings from tourism because all passengers traveling by airplane to Grenada must first disembark and change planes in Barbados or Trinidad before reaching their ultimate destination of Grenada. Direct access by air to this island could very well have a salutary effect on the growth of the tourist industry in Grenada.

In addition to the airport controversy, other events indicate that relations between the United States and Grenada are at a low ebb. The Administration has refused to receive Grenada's Ambassador to the U.S. and has declined to station an American Ambassador in Grenada. Such intergovernmental contact as does exist between the two countries is carried on by and through the U.S. Embassy staff in Barbados.

Most recently, in his Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI) address to the Organization of American States, President Reagan acknowledged the increasing distance between the two countries, referring to Grenada as a "totalitarian left" regime and specifically excluding it from participation in the CBI.

The Secretary of State, in his annual report to Congress, stated that "Grenada can be considered a Cuban satellite." He further stated that "The Cubans are constructing air and naval facilities, which far exceed the requirements of the tiny island nation." Similarly unfavorable observations about Grenada were advanced in briefings I received from state Department representatives in Washington and U.S. Embassy officials in Barbados.

My perceptions of Grenada and its government were not those shared by the Administration. I was on this tiny island for only three days, but I did travel unchaperoned from one end of the island to the other.

While the Cuban government has supplied funds, equipment and expertise for the PRG's economic development program, there is no significant or noticeable Cuban presence--military or otherwise.

Congressman Conyers and I were privileged to participate in a two hour private conversation with the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister and the Minister for Justice. We discussed with the Prime Minister the three principal criticisms of Grenada made by our State Department: (1) The suspension of portions of Grenada's Constitution dealing with elections; (2) The detention of and the failure to bring to trial approximately forty-six persons imprisoned for alleged counter-revolutionary activities; and (3) Grenada's failure to maintain a non-aligned position in world councils.

Grenada's responses to these allegations were straightforward and to the point:

(1) Regarding the suspension of portions of the Constitution dealing with elections: No newly established revolutionary government necessarily accepts in toto the Constitution or laws of the preceding government that it has deposed. A Constitution Commission is presently engaged in drafting a new Constitution that will reflect the declared aims of the reformist government. Moreover, under the Westminister (parliamentary) system which Grenada follows, elections are but one means of ascertaining the will of the electorate. Generally, elections are only proposed when the government wants to be reassured that it continues to enjoy the confidence of its citizens. There is no fixed time or period for elections.

Further, the government of Grenada believes that it is able to ascertain the will of its citizenry through the Parish and Tonal (sub-parish) councils that have been organized all over the island during the past three years since the revolution. These council meetings of workers, farmers, women and men are held monthly, and involve approximately eighty percent of the adult population. (This level of participation is admirable by U.S. standards when compared to the generally high level of apathy of our electorate.)

(2) Regarding the detention of and the failure to bring to trial approximately forty-six persons imprisoned for alleged counter-revolutionary activities: In my conversation with the Minister of Justice Radix, I inquired about the detention of persons being held for alleged counter-revolutionary activities.

The explanation provided me is that after the 1979 revolution, the new government detained 400 persons. All the detainees were released by the first of the year, 1982, with the exception of 46 persons.

The most significant deficiency, viewed from an American perspective, in the current system is the use of the "preventive detention" law to detain political dissidents. According to "People's Law No. 8",

> Any person who has taken or has threatened to take or is reasonably suspected of intending to take action of such a nature or on such a scale as is likely to endanger the public safety or to deprive the community or any substantial portion thereof of supplies or services essential to life is liable on the order of the authority responsible for national security to be placed in preventive detention...

A special tribunal is established to review cases of preventive detention. The detaining authority, however, is under no legal obligation to act in accordance with the recommendation of the tribunal. In addition, Habeas Corpus has been suspended with regard to preventive detention.

According to the Minister of Justice, the problem that the government is facing in regard to the detention of the remaining prisoners is that Grenada has a dearth of judicial and legally trained talent to accommodate this number of cases expeditiously and fairly.

In an attempt to assuage the backlog of cases, the government created a special tribunal, which has conducted its own investigations and hearings. As a result, the majority of the 400 persons were set free. Others were duly tried and sentenced. The tribunal is now investigating and will dispose of the remaining cases as soon as possible.

The government of Grenada appears to be sensitive to international criticism of its preventive detention law used to detain political dissidents and its suspension of Habeas Corpus in matters regarding preventive detention. No prognosis, however, was offered regarding the future of the government's preventive detention policy.

(3) Regarding Grenada's failure to maintain a non-aligned position in world councils: The government maintains that the allegation that Grenada is not non-aligned is patently untrue. Grenada, like any other sovereign nation, makes its decisions, prognoses, and evaluations independently of any other country. Its world view, like the world view of other nations, is often based on what it believes to be in its own best interest.

The contemporary economic and political situation in Grenada is such that this small island nation often finds itself opposed to the economic and political views advanced by the United States. Examples of divergencies in U.S.-Grenada positions on international issues include, but are not limited to, El Salvador, South African apartheid, Namibia, the Middle East, the Law of the Sea Conference, and the introduction of military forces into the Caribbean Basin.

Grenada generally identifies with the "have not" nations of the world; and, the extent that this identification parallels the views of Cuba and the U.S.S.R., is purely coincidental. Thus Grenada's views can also be construed to coincide with France and Mexico with regard to El Salvador and other issues pertaining to Latin America and the Caribbean; with the countries of southern Africa with respect to Israel, Egypt and the Middle East; and with many Asian and European countries with regard to the Soviet Union. Grenada's political alignment, however, should not be further construed as coinciding with southern African, European, or Mideastern nations, just as it should not be misconstrued as coinciding with Cuba or the U.S.S.R.

Conclusion

The visit and meeting helped me to understand better the policies of the government of Grenada. I am assured that the government and the people of Grenada desire normal and friendly relations with the United States based on the principles of self-determination and national sovereignty.

I would strongly urge that the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs hold hearings on Grenada in the near future and that this Subcommittee undertake a fact finding mission to the entire eastern Caribbean so that Congress may be better able to assess the conditions and needs of that region of the world.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. **Dymally**. Finally, I would like to say that if any recommendations result from these proceedings, I would hope the first recommendation would be the recognition of Grenada's Ambassador-designate to the United States. We surely are big enough and powerful enough to allow one little nation of 110,000 people the dignity of diplomatic representation without jeopardizing our national security.

I would add, Mr. Chairman, my strong sentiment, and that of the caucus, that a second hearing be scheduled in order to hear testimony from representatives of the public and private sectors of Grenada.

The testimony we are hearing today, while important and helpful, is undeniably one-sided in that we are all Americans. The formulation of sound U.S. policy, it would seem to me, requires consideration as well of the viewpoints of those to whom our policy is directed.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Barnes**. Thank you very much, Mr. Dymally.

I note that you regard the administration's present posture as petty, arbitrary, discriminatory, outrageous, and absurd. I take it from that, you have a negative view of the administration's posture.

Mr. **Dymally**. I couldn't find any more appropriate words than that, Mr. Chairman.

I think that it is really ridiculous to behave in such a petty fashion toward a country whose people have such great goodwill toward the United States. We have some differences with the leaders of that country, but the people as a whole are very, very pro-American and that is one thing that we must keep in mind.

Another point, Mr. Chairman, the other islands, despite what the State Department may tell you, are very concerned about the behavior of the State Department toward Grenada. In private conversations, they will volunteer that they believe the U.S. policy is counterproductive.

Mr. **Barnes**. We have a vote on the floor. So we will recess for 6 or 7 minutes, while we vote, and then we will continue the hearing.

Mr. **Dymally**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Recess.]

Mr. **Barnes**. Ladies and gentlemen, we will continue our hearing on the United States policy toward Grenada. We are very pleased that the next witness to appear before the subcommittee is the Honorable George W. Crockett, Congressman from Michigan, a good friend and member of the committee.

George, we welcome you to the subcommittee, and look forward to hearing your testimony this afternoon.

STATEMENT OF HON. GEO. W. CROCKETT, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. **Crockett**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I was not aware, until I got the official announcement, that we were having these hearings with respect to Grenada. I do want to express my appreciation to the chairman and to the members of the subcommittee for scheduling this hearing. I was somewhat surprised, however, when I looked at the list of witnesses and found that there was no one directly speaking for the people of Grenada.

I was aware that there has been some problem associated with recognizing the designated Ambassabor from Grenada to the United States, but I also was aware that we do have in our midst the designated Grenadian representative to the Organization of American States.

So I made it a point to get in touch with Ambassador Williams to ascertain from her, in the event she had been called as a witness, what would her testimony be. When she began to outline it to me, I said, "Good. Put it in writing, let me have it, and I will share with the committee the views that you otherwise would have presented had you been invited." So what I shall read to you now represents the views of the Ambassador from Grenada to the Organization of American States.

I might say, by way of introduction, that I have visited Grenada, as my colleague, Congressman Dymally, pointed out. Following that visit, I did file a rather extensive report with the chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee and I did send copies to each member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The statement I have from Ambassador Williams reads as follows:

STATEMENT OF AMBASSADOR DESSIMA WILLIAMS

The Government of Grenada welcomes the decision of the United States House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs to conduct hearings on U.S.-Grenada relations. We understand that this is as a result of a direct proposal of the Congressional Black Caucus and we congratulate the Caucus on its initiative and leadership on this issue.

For the past three years, the United States Government has misunderstood, and often deliberately distorted, the goals, objectives and aspirations of the Grenada revolution, of our country's foreign policy, and the People's Revolutionary Government. Even now we remain concerned about the true motives and objectives of the Reagan Administration towards our Government in particular, and the Grenada revolution in general.

U.S. POLICY OF DETERMINED HOSTILITIES

A policy of determined hostilities, isolation, and even aggression seems to characterize White House and State Department relations toward Grenada today. However, despite this unpleasant and difficult policy on the part of the present Reagan Administration, the Government of Grenada remains willing to work towards normal and mutually friendly relations based on respect for each of the sovereignty and just national aspirations.

Only one day after March 13, 1979, the Grenada Government invited several ambassadors in the region to come to Grenada for a first-hand view of the revolutionary process unfolding in the country. We saw this as an opportunity for many Governments to see and analyze the situation first-hand, as a way to formulating an objective and workable policy between their respective country and Grenada. But it was only the United States, through then Ambassador Frank Ortiz, who unleased an arrogant litany of U.S. policy dictates which we considered far from reflective of an attitude of respect for our sovereignty and a desire for friendly relations.

STATE DEPARTMENT REBUFF

Despite this initial rebuff, we have never ceased efforts to improve our relations with the United States. Thus, though our ambassador to the U.S. has been refused accreditation, numerous ministers, including our Deputy Prime Minister and our Foreign Minister, have visited this country in an effort to improve our relations. On each of those occasions, we have been thwarted by a State Department that has refused to receive our ministers at an official level, as well as reject Grenada's honest proposals and undertakings.

In March and again in August, 1981, our Prime Minister wrote President Reagan, expressing a desire for better relations between our two countries. To this date, no reply from President Reagan has been received to these letters. How are we to interpret such unprecedented behavior.

U.S. ATTEMPTS TO BLOCK ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

At the same time, however, under the direction of the Reagan Administration, attacks against our Government and people have continued. Thus, in the economic field, vicious attempts by the Reagan Administration to block EEC assistance for the construction of our economically vital international airport are a historical fact of the year 1981.

Equally factual are the Administration's attempts during that same year to block economic assistance to our country from the CDB, combined with this attempt at economic strangulation has been the reality of military intimidation, "as exemplified in Amber and the Amberines offensive in ocean venture 1981, and in 1982 ocean venture exercises, designating sections of Grenada's air space as danger zones and calling for a halt in air traffic without a single consultation with Grenada."

Then, of course, there has been the verbal onslaught of misinformation which started in 1979, but undoubtedly reached its peak in recent comments by President Reagan at the Organization of American States in February, 1982, and again in Barbados in March, 1982.

We reject the labels of totalitarianism and the many major inaccuracies leveled at our democratic process which is steadily unfolding. Without a doubt, the negative and hostile attitude of the United States Government has been intended to hurt Grenada tremendously, particularly in regard to our tourist trade.

PROGRESS IN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Despite these massive external pressures, we have nevertheless survived and in the short space of three years, we have been able to successfully begin the transformation of our society from the legacy of colonial under-development and neo-colonial subjugation into a society of genuine socio-economic transformation and democratic involvement at all levels. This is evident through the establishment of institutions designed to insure self-reliant development and participatory democracy.

Economically, Grenada has made tremendous progress. Infrastructure, both human and physical, is growing. Roads exist where there were none before, and our young people are being trained in some 42 different fields. The economy is being turned around with 3.1 percent growth in 1980 and 2.1 in 1981. Again in 1981, we realized 75 percent or 67.83 E.C. of capital expenditure programmed.

Our regional trade has been revitalized and extended. The role of the Government in economic and social life has been increasing in a positive way since the revolution. In 1981, the PRG continued its programs aimed at bringing material benefits to the people. These programs continue to reduce the cost of living for the working people in 1982 because of the increasing number of services provided at either free or at greatly reduced cost.

In addition, existing programs were intensified. This meant that the real income or the social wage of the worker, the worker's real purchasing power, is higher because he or she has to pay less or nothing at all for an array of services which are essential to the growth and welfare of the family.

WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

The progress of Grenadian women is worth particular mention. In the first three years of the Grenada revolution, the women of our country are probably the one group which has come closest to Grenada's ideal of full popular participation in the developmental process.

Our women's movement began with the setting up of a woman's arm of the New Jewel Movement in December, 1977. Today there are approximately 8,000 national members. The new maternity leave in the pay law of 1980 is one of the positive results of the National Women's Organization as is the creation of day nurseries and pre-primary schools, all joint ventures between the NWO community groups and Government.

The country has also made tremendous strides in the field of education. The center for popular education has undertaken the challenging task of eradication of the problem of illiteracy in the country and today, two years later, it has recorded success and its work continues. The national in-service teacher education program, which is designed to train the untrained teachers in the primary and junior secondary system is another success story of the Government and of the revolution.

Undoubtedly, we are proud of our socio-economic achievements in the face of intense hostility. At the same time it is clear that these achievements pose no threat, other than an end to poverty and exploitation. We are confident that you share this obvious aim of the PRG.

GRENADA AS A THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES

With this in mind, we want to put on record our total rejection of attempts by the present Administration to depict our country as a threat to the security of the United States. We pose no threat to any country. Our war is only with the economic under-development of our country and our people. It is that struggle that is best exemplified by the construction of our new international airport, an effort 25 years in the making, a project that offers tremendous economic potential for our country, both in trade and tourism, and a normal, modern commercial life.

These efforts at peaceful internal socio-economic and political development by the PRG are mirrored in our foreign policy where the promotion of peace, justice, and good neighborly relations form cornerstones of our external relations.

BETTER UNITED STATES-GRENADA RELATIONS

We seek better relations with the United States of America. It is for this reason that we have already issued invitations to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, through Senator Charles Percy, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, through Congressman Clement J. Zablocki, to visit our country and hold talks with us. We further register our deep satisfaction at the visit to Grenada of members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

It is our hope that these hearings today will go a long way towards the achievement of better understanding and improved relations.

That completes the statement, Mr. Chairman, that I received from Ambassador Williams, and I would ask unanimous consent to have it included in the record at this point.

Mr. **Barnes**. It is already in the record, Mr. Crockett, because you have read it into the record.

Mr. **Crockett**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will answer whatever questions I can.

Mr. **Barnes**. Thank you, Mr. Crockett.

As the gentleman from Michigan is no doubt aware, representatives of foreign governments and representatives of international organizations rarely consent to testify before congressional committees. Also, they normally have other means of access to our Government.

For these reasons, it has been the practice of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the subcommittees of the committee not to invite official representatives of foreign governments to testify before our committee and subcommittees. So I must say I congratulate the gentleman for his ingenuity in getting around this practice of the committee and presenting directly the views of Ambassador Williams for our record.

Mr. **Crockett**. It was not a case of ingenuity with me, it was simply a case of wanting to know Grenada's side of the question. I think the oversight responsibility of our full committee, as well as every subcommittee, is to accept information from whatever source it is available. If an ambassador is willing voluntarily to come before the committee and testify, I think certainly an opportunity should be afforded.

Mr. **Barnes**. I agree with the gentleman that members of the committee certainly need to have access to the views of the Government of Grenada. As chairman of the subcommittee, I met yesterday with Ambassador Williams and I meet with her on a regular basis as I know many of my colleagues on the committee do.

I recognize the gentleman from Florida for any questions that he may have.

Mr. **Mica**. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Let me just say that I, too, commend the gentleman from Michigan. Whether I agree or disagree, in whole or in part, with what he has had to say, I commend him for the work that he has done on this, and I appreciate having the opportunity to hear this information.

Mr. **Barnes**. Mr. Crockett, we certainly thank you for taking the time to appear before the subcommittee and presenting this testimony.

Our next witness will be the Honorable Stephen W. Bosworth, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs of the Department of State.

While Mr. Bosworth is coming up, I want to enter into the record at this time, if there is no objection, a statement that the subcommittee has received by our colleague Mr. Dellums, and also a statement from the national chapter of the U.S.-Grenada Friendship Society. If there is no objection, we will enter those statements in the record at this time.

[The statements referred to follow:]

STATEMENT OF HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have been afforded this opportunity to testify before the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee. This hearing is of utmost importance to many and is a sincere effort on the part of my colleagues to address the serious and dangerous void in United States-Grenada relations. My appreciation is extended to the committee for its concern with such a sensitive issue.

During the past few years the Caribbean has become a region of increasingly political and strategic interest to the United States. In the fall of 1980, the Administration cited the Grenada Revolution as indeed a case of Soviet/Cuban agression in the Western Hemisphere when the Grenadian-Cuban cooperation on the new international airport project began. According to the Administration, this cooperation was an indication of "Cuban expansionism". The State Department and the Pentagon have described the airport as "an airfield much larger than the small island's tourist industry will require" and assert that, "with its strategic location, the airfield could serve as a staging area and refueling stop for Cuban troops in route to Africa or South America and another Soviet base in the Western Hemisphere capable of servicing Soviet bombers".

Given the views of the United States Government, I believe that it is critical that this Committee, as well as the Armed Services Committee of which I am a member, and the entire body of the United States Congress be presented a factual view of Grenada and its perceived military threat to this country. In his February 24, 1982 address to the Organization of American States the President stated, "the well-being and security of our neighbors in this region are in our own vital interest". Unfortunately, the United States response to the needs of the Caribbean through the Caribbean Basin Initiative is totally inappropriate and does not speak to the economic and social needs of the region. Instead it speaks to the military and security needs of Central America and is aimed at the political and military needs of the Caribbean. United States official and unofficial reports have stated that the airport currently under construction in Grenada is being built by the Cubans for military rather than economic developmental purposes. Although the Grenadians consider this the most important economic and developmental project in their history, the United States response came swiftly and angrily, denouncing the new airport as a military project, the brainchild of Cuba who would wish to use it as a Soviet launch site. The United States has attempted to levy pressure on its Western allies to boycott Grenada's financing of the airport. Such actions have received harsh criticism from diverse sectors internationally.

Secretary of Defense, Casper Weinberger, in his 1983 Annual Report to the Congress stated, "Cuba has not only been active in Nicaragua and El Salvador, but also coordinated clandestine support organizations in Honduras, Costa Rica and Guatemala. In fact, convincing evidence of Cuban subversion has surfaced in virtually every Caribbean Basin country. In Grenada, Cuban influence has reached such a high level that Grenada can be considered a Cuban satellite. The Cubans are constructing air and naval facilities on Grenada, which far exceed the requirements of that tiny island nation".

Mr. Weinbergers's comments in the context of the challenge to the Western Hemisphere alleges that this threat is posed by the USSR, Cuba, Grenada and Nicaragua. In an effort to better understand the specific situation regarding Grenada, I recently conducted a fact finding mission to Grenada. Before departing the United States, I visited the headquarters of the Atlantic Fleet. The Atlantic Fleet Commander has authority over United States and NATO units in the Atlantic and Caribbean area. Following extensive and comprehensive briefings, I came away with the absolute impression that nothing being done in Grenada constitutes a threat to the United States or her allies. Mr. Chairman, there is particularly no concern regarding the new international airport currently under construction in Grenada. As a matter of fact, the Atlantic Fleet Commander stated that the new airport is a military non sequitor.

In an effort to better assess specifics regarding the United States military position with respect to the construction of the airport in Grenada, I visited Homestead Air Force Base, home of the Air Defense Command. Fully briefed by high level officials, I was again assured that the airport under construction in Grenada is of no consequence to the United States. Further, it has not now or ever presented a threat to the security of the U.S.

During my visit to Grenada, I met with Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and Deputy Prime Minister Coard to directly discuss the new international airport and the alleged proposed naval site in question. A detailed account of that meeting has been included in my official report to the Armed Services Committee. In brief, the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister reiterated Grenada's position: The airport is needed for the economic development of the island NOT for military use as has been stated by the Departments of Defense and State. It should be noted that I asked and was given permission to visit the airport site and the alleged site of naval facilities. My observations are outlined and detailed in my report to the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to Grenada, President Reagan characterized it as a totalitarian left government and while in Barbados, ironically enough during the same time I was in

Grenada, stated that Grenada "now bears the Soviet and Cuban trademark which means it will attempt to spread the virus among its neighbors". Based on my personal observations, discussion and analysis of the new international airport under construction in Grenada, it is my conclusion that this project is specifically now and has always been for the purpose of economic development and is not intended for military use. Given the facts and figures by our own military experts as well as by the Grenadians themselves, it is my thought that it is absurd, patronizing and totally unwarranted for the United States Government to charge that this airport poses a military threat to the United States national security. Moreover, the use of such allegations by the United States as the basis for a foreign policy of confrontation toward Grenada is counterproductive.

It is my contention that such rhetoric is apparently used to enhance the validity of the allegations regarding military development. Based on facts and figures given by both the Commanders of the Atlantic Fleet and the Air Defense Command who emphatically assured me that the airport is of no military importance to the United States my question to my colleagues is why then the continued rhetoric against Grenada? It seems obvious that there are far more underlying circumstances that surround the issue of United States-Grenada relations than meet the eye. In as much as the United States has not and does not intend to contribute financially or otherwise to the contruction of this airport and given that this airport does not and will not threaten the United States and her allies, it is clear that the

United States should be officially unconcerned with the airport in Grenada.

The economic and social development of this tiny island nation will depend in large on the completion of this project and the United States should in no way attempt to undermine Grenada's pursuit of further development. The long range impact of this airport for Grenada's economy far extends the short rhetoric that is exhibited toward the initiative. Having witnessed the construction process and the commitment of the workers and that of the Government and the people of Grenada, I am convinced of its economic importance. I am further, in agreement with others of the international community, the EEC, the World Bank and all who have studied at length the feasibility of this project that this new airport is a priority undertaking for the survival of the country. I concur that this is of the greatest development potential for Grenada.

Given the United States response to Grenada based on opposing ideological views and differences, it is my sincere hope that my colleagues of this committee will carefully and thoroughly assess and evaluate United States-Grenada relations and use this forum as a basis for a critique of the current hostile and hegemonistic policy toward Grenada. Mr. Chairman, while I see these hearings as a positive step, I am extremely concerned that there are no witnesses from the Grenadian public and private sectors participating in these proceedings. Given the fact that a large part of our current policy is based on issues of human rights, political prisoners, repression and a lack of democracy within Grenada itself, this Committee certainly needs to produce evidence or the lack of in its report. Therefore, I urge that you consider holding another day of hearings to include representatives from Grenada. More important, Mr. Chairman, I hope this committee will use this opportunity as a foundation for a more constructive and conciliatory policy toward a tiny island nation that is deserving not only of the assistance and cooperation of the United States but also of our friendship.

I thank the Chairman and members of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee again for this opportunity to present my views and first hand knowledge regarding the military concerns with respect to Grenada. I hope that my account, as an eyewitness, will prompt others to seek the truth, present fair and constructive arguments against unfounded and unwarranted misconceptions about Grenada and attempt to educate the American public on all aspects of the nature of United States-Grenada relations.

STATEMENT OF THE U.S.-GRENADA FRIENDSHIP SOCIETY

June 15, 1982

TO: THE COMMITTEE ON INTERAMERICAN AFFAIRS

FR: US-GRENADA FRIENDSHIP SOCIETY

TITLE: U. S. Relations With Grenada, W.I.

The US-Grenada Friendship Society deeply appreciates this opportunity to address our concerns about the present relationship between the governments of our country and the government of Grenada.

We commend the Inter-American Affairs Committee for giving priority to the American people's right to know, to involve themselves, and to share their feeling about the United States policy toward Grenada in particular and the Caribbean in general.

Friendship societies have a long heroic and proud history in the development and maintenance of meaningful and mutually beneficial friendships between the peoples of various nations.

In Europe and in Asia, people to people, friendship societies have been the delicate networks as well as the unifying mortar/that keep the eternal bonds between nationalities and nations in tact in spite of cultural, religous, racial, and political differences in views and aspirations.

In this country friendship societies have,at times, been the peoples to peoples bridge over very troubled political waters.

The United States/Soviet Friendship Society is a steadfast bond between the peoples of the US and the peoples of the USSR, and has been since 1943. The US-China Friendship Society, in a similar manner, has maintained the hardy relationship between the peoples of the United States and the peoples of China.

It is in the same manner that the peoples of the United States and the peoples of Grenada have established thier bond of friendship and solidarity. On April 26, 1980 an assembly of individuals from every geographical section of the United States gathered at Howard University in Washington D. C. and established the US-Grenada Friendship Society. The delegates to the founding convention were of varied backgrounds: students, teachers lawyers, farmers, academicians, dentists, religionist, representatives of national organizations. They are white, black, brown, yellow and red. Many of these delegates have personal friendships with Grenadian people that go back 20 and 30 years. Many have personally experienced many stages of Grenada's development. And some of us are people who had never heard about Grenada before March 13, 1979.

Whatever our perious experience, on April 26, 1980 old friends and new were united in one direction: to build a friendship movement between the people of the Unites States and the people of Grenada. As responsible and concerned people the assembly organized itself; adopted bylaws, and a program of work.

The goals and objectives of the US-Grenada Friendship Society, drafted two years ago and in operation today are:

1. To inform the peoples of the U. S. about the peoples and culture of Grenada so as to promote increased friendship between the peoples of these two nations;

2. To provide an opportunity for U. S. and Grenada nationals to work together in a demonstration of this friendship for the achievement of common goals;
3. To inform the people of the U. S. and U. S. based nationals of Grenada and other nations about the programs and policies of the Peoples's Revolutionary Government of Grenada;
4. To work for the development of a U. S. foreign policy toward Grenada and the Caribbean which is supportive of progressive changes there occurring;
5. To actively oppose any attempts at governmental or corporate interference with the sovereignty and internal affairs of Grenada;
6. To provide political, technical and material support to the extend that we are able, to the peoples and government of Grenada.

To support and conduct this program the Society has chartered 7 chapters: Minneapolis, Minn.; New York, N.Y.; Berkley, Calif; Washington, DC; Boston, Mass.; Amherst, Mass; Chicago, Ill. The Society has several organizing committees which will most likely be chartered as chapters at the next annual meeting in August.

The Society has four main focuses: education, tourism;material and technical assistance; growth and development.

An example in gowth,development and education would be the kind of program the Society conducts in cultural exchanges and the joint celebration of commemorative and national holidays in our two countries. For instance, July 4th, U. S. Independence Day is celebrated by Grenadians and U. S. citizens in Grenada at the same time that U. S. citizens and Grenadians are celebrating U. S. July 4th in the United States.

The same is so with February 7th, Grenada's Independence Day, and March 13 the Celebration of the Grenada Revolution. George Washington's and Abraham Lincoln's birthdays are celebrated in both countries As is T. A. Marryshow, the father of the Grenada Federation. A total of 16 commemorative and national days are jointly celebrated by the peoples of our two countries.

We see our work as important not only for the peoples of Grenada and their development; but, equally important to the growth and development of the peoples of the United States.

Young people from the United States who have visited Grenada and had first-hand experience at seeing children and other young people totally involved in building their nation, tell us that they come home with a brighter opinion of themselves and their own worth. In fact, of the many young people who we know to have visited Grenada, not one has returned home with a negative opinion of the experience. A farmer who visited Grenada expressed great concern as to what all of the hue and cry by spokespersons in our government is about. He stated that he could not see anything different in the way that the people of Grenada live and support each other and work together; than the way poor farmers are doing here.

This man echoed the thoughts of many of us, who have visited Grenada; and work together for survival, today and hope for a better tomorrow.

We are keenly aware that survival is greatly dependent upon friendship and good neighborliness.

We are alarmed at the arrogance of the utterances, that Grenada in particular, and the Caribbean in general is somebody's backyard. Instead of our good neighbors and friends.

We are embarressed that when a smaller and less developed neighbor ask for bread; that stones are given instead.

We are appalled that this bullying, ugliness reaches to the point as to try to involve others in participating in these heinous acts; instead of proclaiming the beauty and friendliness of the peoples of all the Americas.

Grenada has given to the U. S. many of her most talented sons and daughters: doctors, lawyers, administrators, teachers, scientists, and plain working folk. Our expression of gratitude is long over due. Before March 13, 1979, the peoples of Grenada were brutalized beyond belief. Since March 13, 1979 Grenadians are standing tall; just as did George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. Grenadians are saying let us begin building our nation; just as did our forefathers and many other Americans, including Martin Luther King, Jr.

Since March 13, 1979 Grenadians are saying, let us develop and expliot the talents of our own people right here in Grenada.

Since March 13, 1979 Grenada and her heroic peoples have captured the minds, hearts and hands of the majority of the World's peoples.

They have done this with their industry, their intelligence, and their integrity; and the friendliness of the peoples of Grenada.

Are these dreams and characteristics to be scorned. We think not!

Again, we thank you for this opportunity to speak on an issue that is dear to the hearts of many Americans.

We request that the Inter-American Affairs Sub-Committee, in its deliberations consider the following:

1. That a special task force be established to work toward building favorable relations between the Governments of the United States and Grenada, W.I.
2. That a date be set for leadership of the various countries of the Americas to met in dialogue on The Caribbean: A Zone Of Peace.

Mr. **Barnes**. I will ask my colleague from Florida to assume the chair for a few minutes, while I attend to a matter that has just arisen. I will be back in a few minutes.

Mr. **Mica**. Mr. Bosworth, if you will proceed with your statement.

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN W. BOSWORTH, PRINCIPAL DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. **Bosworth**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

It is a pleasure to be here this afternoon to meet with the subcommittee and members of the full committee to discuss U.S. relations with Grenada.

EASTERN CARIBBEAN REGION

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to treat the subject of our relations with Grenada within the broader context of U.S. relations with the countries of the eastern Caribbean subregion. This is a region which has become increasingly important to the United States.

During the past 16 years, six countries of the eastern Caribbean have peacefully achieved their independence from Great Britain. With the exception of Grenada, all now have freely elected, democratic governments characterized by their respect for individual rights and the rule of law.

CARIBBEAN BASIN INITIATIVE

The President's announcement of the Caribbean Basin program in February, and his emphasis upon the eastern Caribbean in particular, was tangible evidence of this region's importance not only to the United States but to other major countries of the area.

Working with Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and Canada, the United States has proposed a major and integrated program of trade, investment, and assistance to promote the economic development and social well-being of these island nations, as well as the other countries of the Caribbean Basin. To underscore the importance we attach to this region, President Reagan visited Barbados in April and personally met with elected leaders of many of these new nations.

The democractic governments of this region are seeking to improve the welfare of their peoples within a commitment to freedom, democracy, and respect for human rights. This commitment stands in some contrast to the situation in Grenada.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Maurice Bishop's "New Jewel Movement" overthrew the constitutional government of Prime Minister Eric Gairy in March 1979. The new government initially promised early elections and improved observance of human rights. Its actual performance, however, has been quite different.

It has postponed elections indefinitely and has taken a number of actions which have seriously eroded the human rights of the Grenadian people. Basic freedoms and due process of law have been effectively denied in Grenada. At the same time, Grenada's

People's Revolutionary Government, the PRG, has adopted a military foreign policy harshly critical of the United States and has openly alined itself with Cuba and the Soviet Union.

The New Jewel Movement's coup d'etat marked the first nonconstitutional change of government in the Commonwealth Caribbean.

I would like at this point, Mr. Chairman, to review very briefly the performances we have observed of Mr. Bishop's government in a number of key areas.

PROGRESS TOWARD DEMOCRACY

First, with regard to democracy. At the celebration of the third anniversary of his coup in March, Prime Minister Bishop again said publicly that Westminister-style democracy is dead in Grenada. PRG leaders ridicule the system favored by all other Commonwealth Caribbean countries as democracy for 5 seconds when votes are cast every 5 years.

In Grenada, political pluralism and the legal organization of freely competing political parties have been replaced by a people's democracy of grassroots parish assemblies, controlled by the New Jewel Movement, which serves as an instrument of, rather than as a check on, the PRG itself.

HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION

In the area of human rights, the situation has shown continued deterioration since the PRG came to power. No independent press is allowed to operate. There is no freedom of assembly, no due process of law.

Over 100 political prisoners remain under detention and many have never been formally charged with any crime. The Department of State's 1981 human rights report to the Congress gives details on this situation and merits careful reading.

STATUS OF GRENADA'S ECONOMY

Grenada's economy is in trouble. Like those of its neighbors, it has been seriously affected by the worldwide recession and depressed prices for its export crops. While employing increasingly authoritarian measures to consolidate internal political control, the PRG has permitted the continued existence of private sector economic activity. But private investment is at a standstill in part because most of Grenada's scarce foreign exchange is devoted to public projects, like the Cuban-constructed Point Salines International Airport.

The country relies heavily on foreign assistance, much of it from Cuba and other radical Soviet bloc countries, for the modest rate of current economic growth it has attained. Tourism, traditionally the most dynamic industry, has been declining much more than in other Caribbean countries. The PRG's anticapitalist, anti-American rhetoric has hardly helped to encourge foreign investment or tourism.

FOREIGN POLICY DIRECTION

With regard to foreign policy, the PRG, unlike its neighbors, maintain close relations with Cuba, Soviet bloc countries, and radical Arab States, which are among its primary sources of aid. The oversized airport project is being built principally with Cuban assistance.

In turn, Grenada has adopted foreign policy positions closely linked to those of Cuba and the Soviet Union, and it has strongly criticized U.S. policies like the Caribbean Basin initiative. Grenada, for example, voted with Cuba and the Soviet Union in the United Nations on both Afghanistan and Kampuchea.

In stark contrast to its commonwealth Caribbean neighbors, the PRG has followed the Cuban lead on the South Atlantic crisis, deriding British colonialism. We expect Grenada will repay its debt to Cuba with more than verbal support and votes by providing Cuba access to the Point Salines Airport for transit flights to Africa and other military uses.

Grenada's neighbors have watched carefully as the PRG has become a center for solidarity meetings and established close ties to small, radical movements from elsewhere in the Caribbean. Grenada to some degree acts as a bridge for Cuba to radical or, as some would prefer to say, progressive groups in the eastern Caribbean.

Cuba has provided training to Grenada's vastly expanded security forces and has stationed small numbers of military advisers on the island. Cuba and the Soviet Union have provided arms, transportation, and communications equipment to the Grenadian security forces.

At the same time, Cuba's role in the construction of the Point Salines Airport—a field which will be capable of handling advanced military aircraft—adds a new and serious dimension to our security concerns. It is difficult, if not impossible, to identify any economic justification for the enormous investment being undertaken in the construction of this airfield.

STRAINED RELATIONS

Relations between the United States and the PRG are seriously strained and have been so for some time. As I have indicated, the United States has significant differences with the Government of Grenada on fundamental issues.

For its part, since it took power, the PRG has viewed the United States with hostility and suspicion. Relations were strained under the previous administration. With no change in the attitude or policies of the PRG, they remain cool and are conducted at a level appropriate to the PRG's conduct.

Despite the PRG's professed interest in a high level dialog, we have seen no credible evidence that it is seriously interested in improving relations. On the contrary, PRG anti-American statements seem designed precisely to foster a climate of confrontation with the United States.

For example, Prime Minister Bishop has called President Reagan a "fascist" and has been quoted in the press as describing the Caribbean Basin initiative as "chicken feed" and "an insult" which is "only aimed at achieving military interests."

Moreover, Grenada has charged on numerous occasions and without a shred of evidence that the United States is preparing an invasion of Grenada, and that various U.S. military and naval exercises in the region are part of those preparations.

U.S. direct interests in Grenada are not significant. We maintain diplomatic relations but not at the ambassadorial level. Private sector linkages are minimal, primarily some tourism activity and a medical school, which has some 600 U.S. students.

Nevertheless, we would be seriously concerned should Grenada become a base for subversion in the eastern Caribbean. In particular, we would be concerned if Grenada were to permit Cuba military access to the Point Salines Airport when it is completed. We have made these concerns known to the PRG.

DEMOCRATIC NATIONS OF EASTERN CARIBBEAN

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, we are strengthening our relations with the democratic nations of the eastern Caribbean and we are working with them to address their economic problems. Most face critical problems such as unemployment rates of over 30 percent, severe shortages of skilled workers and managers, dependence on a single crop and a single market, low agricultural productivity, and small domestic markets.

The United States is working to address these problems with assistance in such areas as skills training, agricultural diversification and marketing, and infrastructural improvements which would permit goods to be produced and moved to markets.

Our total proposed assistance to the eastern Carribean region in fiscal year 1982 is $54 million plus the $10 million supplemental proposed under the Caribbean Basin initiative.

The President had the opportunity to listen firsthand to the concerns of the eastern Caribbean leaders in April and to describe his proposals for the Caribbean Basin initiative.

We are also increasing our cooperation in the area of security. Most eastern Caribbean countries maintain no armed forces. With only modest constabulary forces for defense, these countries are potentially vulnerable to takeovers by armed groups on the left like Maurice Bishop's New Jewel Movement, or by criminal elements, such as the group that tried to stage a coup in Dominica last December.

These countries need our help, and enactment of the Caribbean Basin program would provide quick-disbursing assistance to address their most immediate infrastructure and development needs. At the same time, it would offer trade and investment benefits to achieve self-sustaining growth, which will strengthen democratic institutions.

GRENADA MUST SHOW IT WANTS BETTER RELATIONS

The United States desires mutually beneficial relations with all the countries of the region, and Grenada is no exception. Our interest in improved relations with Grenada, however, can only be realized if there are some changes on the part of the PRG, changes that would show that Grenada wants good relations and is prepared to take concrete steps to that end.

For example, if Grenada is serious about having a normal relationship with the United States, it should halt its unrelenting stream of anti-American propaganda and false statements about U.S. policies and actions.

Grenada should move to restore constitutional democracy, including prompt, free, and fair elections, as was promised on numerous occasions by the New Jewel Movement in the early days after the coup. There should be a return to the high standard of human rights observance that is typical of the Caribbean commonwealth islands.

Finally, Grenada should practice genuine nonalinement rather than continuing its present role as a surrogate of Cuba. These changes or even significant progress toward them would indicate a serious interest on Grenada's part in building good relations with the United States and playing a responsible role in the region. We would respond to them positively.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to respond to any questions or comments that you or other members of the subcommittee might have.

[Mr. Bosworth's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF STEPHEN W. BOSWORTH, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to meet with you and the members of the committee to discuss our relations with Grenada. The Eastern Caribbean sub-region has become increasingly important to the United States. During the past sixteen years, six countries of the Eastern Caribbean have peacefully achieved their independence from Great Britain. With the exception of Grenada, all have freely elected, democratic governments characterized by their respect for individual rights and the rule of law. Small in both size and population, most still depend substantially on tourism and the export of a narrow range of agricultural products for their economic livelihood. In addition to their economic vulnerability, the social problems of these island nations have been exacerbated by high unemployment and the emigration of skilled labor. Strategically, this region sits astride major shipping lanes which are important to the commerce and security of the United States.

The President's announcement of the Caribbean Basin program in February was tangible recognition of this region's importance not only to the United States but to other major countries of the area. In cooperation with Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Canada, our nation has proposed a major and integrated program of trade, investment and assistance to promote the economic development and social well-being of these island nations, as well as the other countries of the Caribbean Basin. To underscore the importance we attach to the Caribbean, President Reagan visited Barbados in April and personally met with elected leaders of many of these new nations.

Proud and independent, the democratic governments of this region are seeking to improve the welfare of their peoples within a commitment to freedom, democracy, and respect for human rights. This commitment stands in contrast to the situation in Grenada.

Maurice Bishop's New Jewel Movement overthrew the constitutional government of Prime Minister Eric Gairy in March 1979. The new Government initially promised early elections and improved observance of human rights. Its actual performance, however, has been quite different. It has postponed elections indefinitely and has taken a number of actions which have seriously eroded the human rights of the Grenadian people. Basic freedoms and due process of law have been effectively denied in Grenada. At the same time, Grenada's People's Revolutionary Government (PRG) has adopted a militant foreign policy harshly critical of the U.S. and has openly aligned itself with Cuba and the Soviet Union.

I.

The New Jewel Movement's coup d'etat sent shock waves throughout the Eastern Caribbean as it marked the first non-constitutional change of government in the Commonwealth Caribbean. Since the coup, Grenada has continued to participate in regional institutions like CARICOM, the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, the Eastern Caribbean Currency Authority, and the Caribbean Development Bank, but not in the West Indies Supreme Court, from which Grenada withdrew shortly after the New Jewel Movement suspended the constitution and judicial guarantees. While maintaining such traditional institutional links, the PRG has taken positions contrary to those of most of its neighbors on issues fundamental to the region and to the hemisphere.

Democracy. At the celebration of the third anniversary of his coup in March, Bishop again said publicly that Westminister-style democracy is dead in Grenada. PRG leaders ridicule the system favored by all other Commonwealth Caribbean islands as "democracy for five seconds when votes are cast every five years." In Grenada, political pluralism and the legal organization of freely competing political parties have been replaced by a "people's democracy" of grass roots parish assemblies, controlled by the New Jewel Movement, which serves as an instrument of, rather than as a check on, the PRG.

Human Rights. The human rights situation has shown continued deterioration since the PRG came to power. No independent press is allowed to operate. Shortly after coming to power, the PRG shut down the island's major newspaper, Torchlight, which had originally supported the ouster of Gairy. Another independent newspaper was closed just last summer after only one edition. There is no freedom of assembly, no due process of law. Over 100 political prisoners remain under detention and many have never been formally charged with any crime. The Department of State's 1981 human rights report to the Congress gives details on the situation and merits careful reading.

Economic Development. Grenada's economy is in trouble. Like those of its neighbors, it has been affected seriously by the world-wide recession and depressed prices for its export crops. While employing increasingly authoritarian measures to consolidate internal political control, the PRG has permitted the continued existance of private sector economic activity. But private investment is at a standstill, in part because most of Grenada's scarce foreign exchange is devoted to public projects, like the Cuban-constructed Point Salines International airport. Although the PRG recently returned to its owners a Coca-Cola plant confiscated in September 1979, the climate for private investment remains uncertain. The country relies heavily on foreign assistance, much of it from Cuba and other radical Soviet Bloc countries, for the modest rate of current economic growth. Tourism, traditionally the most dynamic industry, has been declining much more than in other Caribbean countries. The PRG's anti-capitalist, anti-American rhetoric has hardly helped to encourage foreign investment or tourism.

Foreign Policy. Unlike its neighbors, the PRG maintains close relations with Cuba, Soviet Bloc countries and radical Arab states, which are primary sources of aid. The oversized airport project at Point Salines is being built principally with Cuban assistance. In turn, Grenada has adopted foreign policy positions closely linked to those of Cuba and the Soviet Union, and it has strongly critized U.S. policies like the

Caribbean Basin Initiative. Grenada, for example, voted with Cuba and the Soviet Union in the United Nations on Afghanistan and Kampuchea. In stark contrast to its Commonwealth Caribbean neighbors, the PRG has followed the Cuban lead on the South Atlantic crisis, deriding "British colonialism." We expect Grenada will repay its debt to Cuba with more than verbal support and votes by providing Cuba access to the Point Salines airport for transit flights to Africa and other military uses.

Security. Grenada's neighbors have watched carefully as the PRG has become a center for "solidarity" meetings and established close ties to small, radical movements from elsewhere in the Caribbean. Grenada to some degree acts as a bridge for Cuba to radical or, as some would prefer to say, "progressive" groups in the Eastern Caribbean. Cuba has provided training to Grenada's vastly expanded security forces and has stationed small numbers of military advisers on the island. Cuba and the Soviet Union have provided arms, transportation, and communications equipment to the Grenadian security forces. At the same time, Cuba's role in the construction of the Point Salines airport -- a field which will be capable of handling advanced military aircraft, adds a new and serious dimension to our security concerns. It is difficult, if not impossible, to identify any economic justification for the enormous investment being undertaken in the construction of this airfield.

II.

Relations between the U.S. and the PRG are seriously strained and have been so for some time. As I have indicated, the U.S. has significant differences with the Government of Grenada on fundamental issues.

Since it took power the PRG has viewed the U.S. with hositility and suspicion. Relations were strained under the previous Administration. With no change in the attitude or policies of the PRG, they remain cool and are conducted at a level appropriate to the PRG's conduct. Despite the PRG's professed interest in a "high-level dialogue," we have seen no credible evidence that it is seriously interested in improving relations. On the contrary, PRG anti-American rhetoric and baseless charges against the U.S. seem designed precisely to foster a climate of confrontation with the U.S. For example, Prime Minister Bishop has called Presidente Reagan a "fascist" and has been quoted in the press as describing the Caribbean Basin Initiative as "chicken feed" and "an insult" which is "only aimed at achieving military interests." Moreover, Grenada has charged on numerous occasions and without a shred of evidence that the U.S. is preparing an invasion of Grenada and that various U.S. military and naval exercises in the region are part of those preparations.

U.S. direct interests in Grenada are not significant. We maintain diplomatic relations but not at the Ambassadorial level. Private sector linkages are minimal, primarily some tourism activity and a medical school which has some 600 U.S. students. Nevertheless, we would be seriously concerned should Grenada become a base for subversion in the Eastern Caribbean. In particular, we would be concerned if Grenada were to permit Cuba military access to the Point Salines airport when it is completed. We have made these concerns known to the PRG.

At the same time, we are strengthening our relations with the democratic nations of the Eastern Caribbean and are working with them to address their economic problems. Most face critical problems such as unemployment rates of over 30 percent, severe shortages of skilled workers and managers, dependence on a single crop and a single market, low agricultural productivity and small domestic markets. The United States is working to address those problems with assistance in such areas as skills training, agricultural diversification and marketing, and infrastructural improvements which would permit goods to be produced and moved to market. Our total proposed assistance to the Eastern Caribbean Region in FY 82 is $54 million plus the $10 million supplemental proposed under the CBI. The President had the opportunity to listen first-hand to the concerns of the Eastern Caribbean leaders in April and to describe his proposals for the Caribbean Basin Initiative. We are also increasing our cooperation in the area of security. Most Eastern Caribbean countries maintain no armed forces. With only modest constabulary forces for defense, these countries are potentially vulnerable to takeovers by armed groups on the left like Maurice Bishop's New Jewel Movement, or by criminal elements, such as the group that tried to stage a coup in Dominica last December.

These countries need our help. Enactment of the Caribbean Basin program would provide quick-disbursing assistance to address their most immediate infrastructure and development needs. At the same time it would offer trade and investment benefits to achieve self-sustaining growth, which will strengthen democratic instutitions.

The United States desires mutully beneficial relations with all the countries of the region, and Grenada is no exception. Our interest in improved relations with Grenada, however, can only be realized if there are changes on the part of the PRG; changes that would show that Grenada wants good relations and is prepared to take concrete steps to that end. For example, if Grenada is serious about having a normal relationship with the U.S., it should halt its unrelenting stream of anti-American propaganda and false statements about U.S. policies and actions. Grenada should restore constitutional democracy, including prompt free and fair elections, as was promised on numerous occasions by the New Jewel Movement in the early days after the coup. There should be a return to the high standard of human rights observance that is typical of the Commonwealth Caribbean islands. Finally, Grenada should practice genuine non-alignment rather than continuing its present role as a surrogate of Cuba. These changes or even significant progress toward them would indicate a serious interest on Grenada's part in building good relations with the U.S. and playing a responsible role in the region. We would respond to them positively.

Mr. **Barnes**. Thank you very much, Mr. Bosworth, and I apologize to you for being called out of the room on an emergency question that just arose.

Let me recognize my colleagues who are here, who were able to hear all of your testimony before I pose some questions. Let me call first on the distinguished gentleman from New York, the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, Mr. Gilman.

Mr. **Gilman**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Ambassador, we appreciate your comments and welcome you before the committee once again.

FULFILLMENT OF REVOLUTIONARY PLEDGES

Has the new government fulfilled its pledges for moderate social reform and free elections, a constitutional government, and full human rights, made at the time of the coup?

Mr. **Bosworth**. No, Mr. Gilman, in our judgment they very much have not. As I indicated, they had promised prompt and early elections soon after the coup, and those have now been postponed indefinitely. Given their characterization of Westminister-style democracy, which they characterize as a vote in 5 seconds which lasts 5 years, I think one would have to question whether their current intent is to have elections. They certainly are not moving in that direction.

Their performance in the area of human rights remains far below the standard of the other countries in the eastern Caribbean. Their performance generally with regard to the political rights of their citizens is also far deficient from that standard set by the other countries of that region.

POLITICAL PRISONERS

Mr. **Gilman**. Are there presently any political prisoners being held by the Government of Grenada?

Mr. **Bosworth**. We estimate, Mr. Gilman, that there are approximately 100 political prisoners being held in Grenada, some of whom we understand are still being held with no formal charges having been brought against them.

Mr. **Gilman**. Has that number increased or decreased significantly since the revolution?

Mr. **Bosworth**. I think it increased significantly right after the revolution, but it has not, as far as I am aware, increased substantially in recent months, although I would be pleased to check on that and provide an answer for you in more detail.

[The following was subsequently submitted:]

Question. Has the number of political prisoners held in Grenada increased or decreased significantly since the revolution?

Answer. The first arrest of oppositionists to Grenada's New Jewel Movement began on March 13, 1979 and have continued to date. It is estimated that since 1980 more than one hundred political prisoners have been incarcerated in Grenada at any given time. Independent Grenadian journalist Alister Hughes reported in his "Newsletter" of June 12, 1982, that 131 persons are currently being held. Of this number, 97 are said to be detained under the preventive detention regulations, 20 have been charged under the 1980 terrorism law, 12 others may have been charged, and 2 have turned states' evidence but remain in custody. The accuracy of the "Newsletter" article cannot be verified due largely, as Hughes points out, to the refusal of the People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada to publish an updated list of political detainees. Similarly unknown is the treatment accorded detainees, though recent reports have mentioned curtailment of visitation privileges since the visit of President Reagan to Barbados in April 1982. Our Embassy in Bridgetown continues to receive allegations of prisoner mistreatment by guards. Based upon the Alister Hughes report, the Department is again actively seeking the assistance of the International Red Cross to appeal for humanitarian rights of political detainees in Grenada.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. **GILMAN**. Has there been any progress made since the revolution with regard to employment, and with regard to development in the country of Grenada?

Mr. **BOSWORTH**. It is difficult to perceive any progress, Mr. Gilman. In fact, as you know, almost all of the economies of that region have been very hard hit by the world recession and declining prices for their exports.

However, it would appear that the economic deterioration in Grenada has been far more substantial even than that in the other countries. This is due to some extent to the very heavy dependence that they have on tourism, and tourism is down some 50 percent, I believe, in the course of the last year or two.

It is, I suppose, not surprising to find that it is down since much of the tourism had come from the United States, and given the Government's characterization of the United States, it is not surprising that many private American citizens do not care to take their vacations there.

SUPPORT FOR BISHOP GOVERNMENT

Mr. **GILMAN**. Ambassador Bosworth, are there indications that the wide support for change that was seen with the change of the regime back in 1979 has matured into full support for the Bishop-inspired reforms among the general population?

Mr. **BOSWORTH**. Not to the best that we can observe, Mr. Gilman. I think it is true that there was substantial popular opposition to the previous government, but we have seen no evidence that that popular opposition has been transformed into popular support for this regime. Indeed, the very vigorous strengthening that the government has undertaken of the security forces, the presence there of Cuban advisers, et cetera, would probably be designed to some degree to insure that the political scene remains as cool as possible.

GRENADA AS A SECURITY THREAT

Mr. **GILMAN**. Do the other moderate governments in the Windward Islands feel threatened by Bishop and his revolution, and his growing relationship with Cuba?

Mr. **BOSWORTH**. We maintain very close consultations with the other governments of the eastern Caribbean on the question of Grenada and the policies of Mr. Bishop.

It is, I think, quite clear that many of these governments are concerned not only by the trends that they see in Grenada itself, but also are concerned by the links that the Grenadian Government has sought to establish with radical groups in other countries.

While, obviously, it is the subject primarily of diplomatic discussion, rather than public dialog, I think it is safe and fair to say that many of the democratic leaders of the eastern Caribbean are concerned about Grenada's role within the region.

Mr. **Dymally**. Would the gentleman from New York yield for just one question?

Mr. **Gilman**. Yes, I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. **Dymally**. Mr. Bosworth, is it not true that in the presence of the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Barbados said for all to hear that the Soviets and Cuba did not pose a threat to the islands from Grenada?

Mr. **Bosworth**. That the Soviets and Cubans did not pose a threat to the islands from Grenada?

Mr. **Dymally**. Right.

Mr. **Bosworth**. I am honestly not aware that such a statement along those lines was made, Mr. Dymally.

Mr. **Dymally**. Could you have missed that?

How could you have missed a statement from your Embassy made by the Prime Minister of Barbados in the presence of the President of the United States regarding the presence or the alleged presence of the Soviets in Cuba and Grenada? How could your Embassy have missed giving you that information?

Mr. **Bosworth**. We are not arguing or trying to maintain, Mr. Dymally, that the presence of Soviets or the presence of Cubans in Grenada in and of itself constitutes a threat to the neighboring countries. The extent to which Grenada constitutes a threat to the neighboring countries evolves from the links that Grenada itself maintains with radical elements within these countries.

So I don't think it would be true that the countries are concerned that somehow Cuba is going to stage an invasion of them from Grenada. That is not the point of their concern. The point of their concern is the ideological influence and other influences which they find that the Government of Grenada is attempting to exercise directly within their countries.

Mr. **Dymally**. Thank you, Mr. Gilman.

Mr. **Gilman**. Mr. Ambassador, has the government changed its position with regard to the press?

It closed down the only independent newspaper in St. George, as well as the Catholic newsletter. What is the government's attitude now toward the press?

Mr. **Bosworth**. There is no free press in Grenada, Mr. Gilman. The government, soon after coming to power, closed the newsletter, the Torchlight I think it is called. Another newspaper, I understand, was established sometime last year and closed after one or two editions were published. I think it is very fair to say that there is no freedom of the press in Grenada.

NEW AIRPORT IN GRENADA

Mr. **Gilman**. Can you tell us a bit about the controversial airstrip? Is there really a need for that large an airstrip for the Government of Grenada, or does that have some military implications?

Mr. **Bosworth**. As we have indicated publicly, we are concerned that it might have potential military use. Grenada justifies the construction of this airstrip, which is an enormously expensive capital project, particularly given Grenada's own resources, as being necessary for Grenadian tourism and for Grenadian trade.

However, if one bears in mind that Grenada has a current hotel bed capacity of about 1,000, it is clear that it would not require more than 2 or 3 large aircraft to fill that bed capacity for a very long time. In other words, there is a disproportion between the size of the airstrip that it is attempting to construct and any realistic aspirations it could have with regard to the flow of tourism.

We do know, Grenada has so stated, that Cuba has played a very major and significant role in the construction of this airstrip. A simple examination of a map would confirm that that airstrip could have a very high potential military significance.

We don't object to Grenada investing in things which are rational for its own economic development, far from it and to the contrary. However, we are not convinced that this airstrip has an economic justification and this causes us to ask them what is its justification.

ALINEMENT WITH CUBA

Mr. **Gilman**. There is a great deal of evidence of the new nonalined status that has emerged from Grenada—constant support of Cuba, its declarations on U.S. policy, its warmongering in refusing to condemn the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in the U.N. General Assembly.

Are there any other allegations that Grenada makes that indicate its position?

Mr. **Bosworth**. I think that its stated public position on virtually all issues which have acquired any East-West significance in the last year to 18 months, Mr. Gilman, have almost without exception been 100 percent hewing to the line established by the Soviet Union. I think Afghanistan is an excellent example, and the U.N. resolution on Kampuchea is another one.

Their public posture and public statements on the Falkland Islands crisis are, I think, another example of their complete identification with, in this instance, the Cuban line.

Then, of course, there are their constant and unrelenting criticism of U.S. programs, policies, and personalities in the U.S. Government. All would lead us to conclude rather solidly that there is no legitimate manner in which Grenada could be described as a truly nonalined government.

There are many nonalined governments in the world, and we have very satisfactory, and in many cases very close, relationships with a number of them. So nonalinement by itself in no way disqualifies a country from having good relations with the United States, but we do distinguish between true nonalinement and what is in fact a false nonalinement.

Mr. **Gilman**. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD GRENADA MAY ENDANGER CBI

Mr. **Barnes**. Mr. Bosworth, I guess you were here when I made some opening comments in which I suggested that our policy toward Grenada, or our lack of a policy toward Grenada might endanger the passage of the CBI, because we might have some problems politically with concerns of some members, which have been expressed by at least two of our colleagues this afternoon. Would you care to comment on that?

Mr. **Bosworth**. I appreciate that comment, Mr. Chairman, and I can understand the rationale behind it. I would only make a couple of brief comments on that.

First of all, as you are aware, the administration did not seek to exclude Grenada from participation in the Caribbean Basin initiative when the program was sent to the Congress. There was in fact only one country which would have been excluded ab initio from the Caribbean Basin initiative and that was, of course, Cuba.

We did not propose that we would give direct aid to Grenada, but the other elements of the Caribbean Basin initiative were on the table, and it was anticipated that they would be open to Grenada in the same manner that they would be open to other countries.

I think, however, that Grenada has made substantial progress toward disqualifying itself on its own initiative from participation in the Caribbean Basin initiative. It certainly has evidenced no desire to consider seriously participation in the Caribbean Basin initiative, quite the contrary.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to bear in mind that there are several other countries in the eastern Caribbean, all of which very much need the assistance which prospectively is offered by the Caribbean Basin initiative, both from the United States and from other countries.

I think that rather than focusing exclusively on the question of Grenada, it is also useful to focus very heavily on the needs of these other countries, all of whom have democratically elected governments, all of whom have very good records in the area of human rights, some of which, yes, disagree with the United States on foreign policy issues. However, as I have indicated, that in and of itself is certainly no reason that the United States cannot have good relations with these countries. They need our assistance and in particular they need the Caribbean Basin initiative.

So I would hope that the Congress, as it considers the President's proposals, will bear in mind that they are designed to help a number of the countries of the eastern Caribbean region.

GRENADA HAS DISQUALIFIED ITSELF FROM CBI

Mr. **Barnes**. Your comment that "we have not disqualified Grenada, Grenada has disqualified itself," is reminiscent of a remark, maybe you made it, an anonymous official at the State Department was quoted in one of the articles in the Washington Post about the CBI some months ago and said,

> We are not excluding anyone from the CBI, any of the nations in the Caribbean basin are eligible to participate, but there are some nations that have decided to exclude themselves on the basis of actions that they have taken.

What has Grenada done to disqualify itself in your judgment?

Mr. **Bosworth**. I would not say that it has formally disqualified itself, and certainly it is not beyond what one might consider to be redemption.

However, its remarks and characterizations of the Caribbean Basin program, as it describes it as "chicken feed," and "only a guise for the attainment of military objectives in the area," would certainly seen to indicate that it has no desire to participate in the Caribbean Basin program.

ISSUES IN UNITED STATES-GRENADA RELATIONS

Mr. **Barnes**. What does the United States want from Grenada right now?

You have outlined some of that in your opening comments, but could you specify directly what the United States would ask Grenada to do?

Mr. **Bosworth**. I attempted to spell that out, Mr. Chairman, in my prepared statement. We are not asking for perfection from Grenada. We do, however, ask that the level and tone of Grenadian rhetoric and criticism of the United States diminish.

We would think it would be useful if Grenada were to give some indication of its plans to return to a constitutional system. We are concerned about its performance in the area of human rights.

We are concerned about the extent to which it is spending its very scarce resources on an airport for which in our view, as I indicated, we are unable to find an economic justification. We are also concerned about its very close, and what appears to be growing ties with Cuba, and its failure to adhere to any type of legitimate nonalinement.

Changes in these areas, I think would be useful and would be indicators to us of a desire on the part of Grenada for more normal relations with us.

Mr. **Barnes**. Why won't we talk to them about some of these issues that concern us?

Mr. **Bosworth**. I think, first of all, we do have channels of communication with Grenada. Just as you indicated that you had met with its Ambassador to the OAS, so does our Ambassador to the OAS have occasion for discussions with Ambassador Williams. We are confident that the Grenadian Government is fully aware of our views with regard to the policies that they have followed both domestically and internationally.

We do have diplomatic relations with Grenada. We have not appointed or accredited an Ambassador; however, I think it is fair to say that we don't lack for means of communication. What we lack is any evidence or any indication that Grenada seriously wants to work toward a better relationship with us.

Mr. **Barnes**. We are going to hear shortly from our former Ambassador to the eastern Caribbean, Ambassador Shelton, and in her testimony that she will present shortly, she says the following in terms of what she thinks the United States ought to do.

She says:

> First, we should accredit an Ambassador to Grenada, and the Ambassador should be unencumbered with instructions which prevent him or her from travelling to Grenada as frequently as necessary to conduct official business; similarly, we should accept the credentials of a Grenadian Ambassador to Washington.
>
> Second, we should meet at an appropriately high level with representatives of the Grenadian Government to discuss the issues, misunderstandings and misperceptions which have brought our relationship to its current low level.

Third, we should refrain from seeking to isolate Grenada by denying it technical, disaster, and project assistance. We should be prepared for a time to support the Grenada Government's efforts to improve the economic plight of their people and we should make clear our hope that elections will be held, political prisoners will be released and freedom of speech will be respected. If after an appropriate period of time human rights problems and intolerance of dissent continue, then the U.S. Government should reassess its assistance.

Fourth, the U.S. Government should refrain from provocative military maneuvers in Caribbean waters. We can achieve our goals far more easily and effectively by stressing our respect for the national sovereignty of the nations of the Caribbean and by supporting their economic development than by a revival of an obsolete policy of gunboat diplomacy.

What is your reaction to Ambassador Shelton's comments?

Mr. BOSWORTH. One of respect. I have a great deal of regard for Ambassador Shelton and for her service in the eastern Caribbean. She was a very outstanding Ambassador there. I would, however, as you might expect, differ with her on some of the judgments that she makes regarding U.S. policy in the region.

I think that it is a question of a difference in terms of perception. We do not perceive that the difficulties that we have with Grenada are due to an absence of communication. Indeed, we feel that we understand very well and that Grenada understands very well the roots of our disagreement.

I have tried to draw a sharp contrast between our relations with Grenada and our relations with the other countries of the eastern Caribbean, and I would certainly not characterize our policy as one of a revival of gunboat diplomacy either toward Grenada or certainly not toward the other countries of the region.

Mr. BARNES. Let me recognize our colleagues who are not members of the subcommittee, who have already presented testimony and have a strong interest in this area.

The gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Crockett, do you have any questions for Ambassador Bosworth?

Mr. CROCKETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bosworth, I gather that your testimony is not the result of personal observation based on personal visits to Grenada, but is a composite of reports that you have received from others in the State Department. Is that correct?

Mr. BOSWORTH. Yes, a composite of those reports, sir, and I suppose a composite of several discussions that I have had on this subject with leaders of other countries in the eastern Caribbean and private sector representatives from those countries.

IMPROVEMENTS IN GRENADA

Mr. CROCKETT. In response to one of the questions from Representative Gilman, whether or not you had noticed any improvement in Grenada in recent years, I think your answer was in the negative.

I have visited Grenada on two occasions. The first time was back in 1966, and the last time was this past March. Certainly, I found terrific improvement over that rather extended period of time.

I was there for 3 days. I had complete freedom to go wherever I wanted to go on the island, and talk with anyone I wanted to talk with. I noticed none of the oppression, none of the denial of civil rights and civil liberties that you tell us about now based on reports that you have received.

I also visited that airport. If you have occasion to go to Grenada, I would suggest that you wait until they get the new airport completed, because the condition of the present airport, you will approach it with great trepidation, believe me. [General laughter.]

You will also be grateful if they can get some money from either the Caribbean Basin initiative or some other place to build a decent highway from the airport into the city, because you literally take your life in your hands going around some of those curves.

POINT SALINES AIRPORT

You spoke quite extendedly about the airport. I have some notes here based on my own observation and the information that I received and I would like to share them with you, because in my judgment I think the jury is still out in this ongoing exchange of contentions between the State Department and the Government of Grenada.

On the way to Grenada, I had occasion, together with Congressman Conyers, to stop off in Barbados, and I think the American Embassy in Barbados is also accredited to Grenada; am I right on that?

Mr. **Bosworth**. That is correct.

Mr. **Crockett**. Of course, we were given the State Department briefing which in all respects was essentially the same as you have given us in your testimony here today.

Mr. **Barnes**. You are glad to hear that.

Mr. **Bosworth**. I am very pleased to hear that.

Mr. **Crockett**. On the airport matter, the airport is smaller than that in Barbados, the Grantley Adams International Airport in Barbados, which is 11,000 feet, and Grenada has a tourist potential not yet achieved that certainly is equal to that of Barbados.

You spoke about the airport being Cuban built and Cuban dominated. Yet, I am told that the principal contractor for the airport in Grenada is an American firm. I don't think we should malign American free enterprise and criticize them for wanting to build the largest airport that the government will permit them to build and pay for.

Second, you spoke about the financing of that airport—incidentally, when completed, the airport in Grenada, I am told, will be the same length as the airport on the neighboring islands of St. Vincent and on the island of Trinidad.

It will permit Grenada to compete for nonstop American and European tourist trade. At the present time, if you want to go to Grenada, you cannot fly nonstop. First because there is no nonstop flight, and second because the planes that would nonstop from the United States could not land in Grenada.

All of that is true, is that not right, Mr. Bosworth?

Mr. **Bosworth**. I have no reason to challenge any of those assertions, no, Mr. Crockett.

Mr. **Crockett**. So that you would have to change planes in Barbados, or change planes in Trinidad, and take a little shuttle plane over to Grenada.

Now with respect to the financing of that airport, I don't think I am telling you anything new, but I am told that Libya contributed $4 million, Syria contributed $2 million, Algeria contributed $6 million, OPEC gave $2 million, and the EEC gave $4 million. Cuba did not give any money at all, but it did give the equivalent of $33.6 million in equipment and personnel for the construction of the airport. ECGD gave $12 million, Venezuela gave $4 million, and the Government of Grenada put in $7 million. If you total that up, you will find that the bulk of the money did not come from a contribution made by the Cuban Government, it was from the contributions made by the other government entities that I enumerated.

So it is sort of maligning the situation, isn't it, to say that the airport is Cuban built when the principal contractor is American and most of the money comes from non-Cuban sources?

Mr. **Bosworth**. I would argue with only one of those statements, Mr. Crockett, with all respect, and that is that we do find that our figures with regard to the contributions from various countries indicate that Cuba has made a very major contribution. Our estimate is that it has made a contribution of approximately $27.5 million—you say, $33 million—that is a pretty big chunk of the airport costs.

Now whether it is a contribution in cash, as some of it was indirect funding, or whether it was a contribution in materiel which Grenada would otherwise have had to buy someplace else, it seems to me makes relatively little difference.

The fact remains that Cuba has had a major economic role in the construction of that airport, and that together with the very close and the very visible ties between Grenada and Cuba, in our mind creates a very great distinction between an airport in Grenada and an airport in one of the other islands of the region which does not have those close ties with Cuba, and which has not created a concern on our part that that airport might be open to Cuban military use. So I think there are some very substantial differences.

We are not arguing in any way, Mr. Crockett, that Grenada should somehow make do with an inadequate, obsolescent, and too-small airport. We recognize that they may well have had a need for a larger and more modern airport. What we question is whether they had a need for this large and this modern an airport, and in particular, given the Cuban role in its construction and the Cuban relationship with Grenada in general, we have a concern as to what the future use of that airport might be.

Mr. **Crockett**. Do you think that St. Vincent, which is about the same size, I guess, as Grenada, with an economy that is perhaps just as poor as that in Grenada, has need for a much larger airport than Grenada?

Mr. **Bosworth**. I think the difference is, without casting any judgment or making any judgment as to whether St. Vincent has a need for that size airport, the difference lies very largely in the nature of the two countries' relationships with Cuba.

Mr. **Crockett**. That is really what it is, it is not the size of the airport.

Mr. **Bosworth**. They argue, Mr. Crockett, that the airport is needed for economic reasons, we are not persuaded by that rationale. As I said, without making final judgments or drawing final conclusions, we are concerned that the airport may indeed have other noneconomic uses in the future.

CRITICISMS OF THE PRG

Mr. CROCKETT. In the report that I made to the Foreign Affairs Committee when I came back, I mentioned the fact that on the way down, we stopped and had a briefing with the American Embassy officials in Barbados. They mentioned, as you have mentioned here, three principal criticisms of Grenada.

The first one was the suspension of portions of Grenada's constitution dealing with elections. The second one was the detention of and the failure to bring to trial approximately 46 persons imprisoned for alleged counterrevolutionary activities. The third was Grenada's failure to maintain a nonalined position in world councils.

Congressman Conyers and I had a 2-hour private conversation with the Grenadian Prime Minister, with the Foreign Minister, and with the Minister of Justice. We wanted to inquire about each of these three criticisms.

Incidentally, if you have not met the Prime Minister, I think you will find him to be one of the most peaceful, cultured lawyers that you have ever met. Notice how I put those three things together? I am a lawyer myself, and we are not always peaceful and we are not always cultured.

Regarding the suspension of portions of the constitution dealing with elections, this was the information we received. No newly established revolutionary government necessarily accepts in toto the constitution or laws of the preceding government that it has deposed. A constitution commission is presently engaged in drafting a new constitution that will reflect the declared aims of the reformist government.

Generally, elections are only proposed when a government wants to be reassured that it continues to enjoy the confidence of its citizens. There is no fixed time or period for elections. The Government of Grenada believes that it is able to ascertain the will of its citizenry through the parish and subparish councils that have been organized all over the island during the past 3 years since the revolution.

The council meetings of workers, farmers, women and men are held monthly and involve approximately 80 percent of the adult population. That is a larger percentage than participates in electing and I hope reelecting me in Detroit. This level of participation, I think, is admirable by U.S. standards, when compared to the generally high level of apathy of our electorate.

Wouldn't you agree, then, Mr. Bosworth, that there are methods of ascertaining the will of the people in whether or not they support a government other than having periodic elections at fixed intervals?

Mr. BOSWORTH. With all respect, Mr. Crockett, I would agree that there may be other methods, but I would not agree that there are other methods which are as desirable as the periodic holding of fixed elections.

It would seem to me, as has been demonstrated in this country, there is a great value in having a system which insures that those who are elected, periodically and regularly, must renew their mandate from the electorate directly, and not receive some mandate through neighborhood committees or grassroots organizations.

Mr. CROCKETT. Now I would like to share with you—

Mr. BARNES. Would the gentleman yield for just a moment?

I don't want to cut the gentleman at all, my only concern is that I also want to give Mr. Dymally an opportunity.

Mr. CROCKETT. I just have one further point.

Mr. BARNES. Fine.

GRENADA'S NONALINED POLICY

Mr. CROCKETT. Regarding Grenada's failure to maintain a nonalined position in world councils, this was the information that we received. The government maintains that the allegation that Grenada is not nonalined is patently untrue. Grenada, like any sovereign nation, makes its decisions, prognoses, and evaluations independently of any other country. Its world view, like the world view of other nations, is often based on what it believes to be in its own best interest.

The contemporary economic and political situation in Grenada is such that this small island nation often finds itself oppposed to the economic and political views advanced by the United States. Examples of divergencies in United States-Grenada positions on international issues include, but are not limited to, El Salvador, South Africa and apartheid, Namibia, the Middle East, the Law of the Sea Conference, and the introduction of military forces into the Caribbean Basin.

Grenada generally identifies with the have-not nations of the world, and the extent that this identification parallels the views of Cuba and the U.S.S.R. is purely coincidental. Thus, Grenada's views can also be construed to coincide with France and Mexico with regard to El Salvador, and other issues pertaining to Latin America and the Caribbean; to coincide with the countries of southern Africa with respect to Israel, Egypt, and the Middle East; and to coincide with many Asian and European countries with regard to the Soviet Union.

Grenada's political alinement, however, should not be further construed as coinciding with southern African, European, or Mideastern nations, just as it should not be construed as coinciding with Cuba or the U.S.S.R.

Wouldn't you agree, Mr. Bosworth, that generally speaking, all countries' foreign policies are determined by how they perceive their own best interest?

Mr. BOSWORTH. I would indeed agree with that, Mr. Crockett. As I indicated earlier, many of the countries in the eastern Caribbean and elsewhere with whom we have very good relations frequently disagree with us on international issues of the type that you have mentioned.

I find it interesting, however, that the Government of Grenada did not cite to you a national interest which was somehow served for Grenada by voting with the Soviet Union on the question of Afghanistan. That seems to me to be difficult to justify in the context of some independently arrived at foreign policy.

Mr. **Crockett.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Barnes.** I want to now recognize the gentleman from California, Mr. Dymally. I will just alert the gentleman that we do have some time constraints. We have got two additional witnesses that we want to hear from this afternoon.

STATEMENTS OF PRIME MINISTER ADAMS OF BARBADOS

Mr. **Dymally.** Mr. Chairman, Mr. Bosworth and I had a boisterous exchange at the Smithsonian Institution, and he knows of my views, so I don't want to play to the gallery today. I simply want to bring to his attention the article in the Washington Post regarding Mr. Adams' statement and I read, "Reagan Relaxing in Caribbean"—by the way, Mr. Bosworth, the President did not go there to meet with the Ministers of the island states, he went there on vacation—I quote: "Earlier Barbadian Prime Minister Tom Adams gently took issue with Reagan's concern about the threat of neighboring Grenada, whose leftist government has close alliances with Cuba. Adams said that neither Cuba nor Grenada was a military threat, and observed that Barbados has five times the per capita income of Grenada, and spends far more in health and education."

Mr. Chairman, during your absence, Mr. Bosworth said that he was not aware of that statement appearing in the Washington Post. When I was there, the CIA was very helpful in gathering all my press statements and forwarded them to me by way of the State Department. I am amazed that they missed this one statement of Mr. Adams.

I will say, Mr. Chairman, in closing, that Mr. Bosworth passed very lightly on the school. He should emphasize the fact that the school is an American school, with 600 students, one of the best offshore medical schools in the world, whose passing grades are the highest of any foreign school. They are not intimidated by any threat in Grenada.

I think that it is somewhat presumptuous of the State Department to outline any sort of foreign policy for any country to follow.

Finally, let me ask Mr. Bosworth one question.

RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN COUNTRIES BY THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. Bosworth, do you know of any all-white or majority white nation that the State Department does not now recognize?

Mr. **Bosworth.** I would have to give that some very careful thought, Mr. Dymally.

Mr. **Dymally.** Let me name some to you. Angola.

Mr. **Bosworth.** I do not know——

Mr. **Dymally.** Grenada.

Mr. **Bosworth.** I hesitate to respond to the question, Mr. Dymally.

Mr. **Dymally.** North Korea.

Mr. **Bosworth.** I am not prepared to——

Mr. **Dymally.** North Vietnam.

Mr. **Bosworth.** I am not prepared to agree in any way that U.S. policy toward an individual country is in any way, or indeed should be in any way characterized or determined by the race of inhabitants of that country.

Mr. **Dymally.** Finally, are the views of 18 members of this body important at all to the State Department?

Mr. **Bosworth.** They indeed are, Mr. Dymally, as you are well aware.

Mr. **Dymally.** I am not aware from the evidence. From our meeting with Mr. Haig, and our subsequent discussions with Mr. Enders, and with you by way of conferences, I do not see, as chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Task Force on the Caribbean, any response at all that is in direct relationship to our concern about Grenada or other countries we bring to your attention, namely, South Africa.

Mr. **Bosworth.** I attempted in my statement, Mr. Dymally, to indicate the contrast between the state of our relations with Grenada and the state of our relations with neighboring countries of the eastern Caribbean. I don't think that there is any possible distinction that could be made between Grenada and those other two countries, except for the policies being pursued by the Government of Grenada. That is the problem in our relationship.

We have listened and we will continue to be willing to entertain and engage in a dialog with you and other members of the caucus on the subject of Grenada. I think it is a very important part of the political process in this country. You, I think, will admit, as I certainly will admit, that at this point we have divergent analyses of the situation in Grenada and, therefore, divergent prescriptions of how the United States should relate to that country.

Mr. **Dymally.** For all of those reasons, you would not recognize their Ambassador, and given the opposition of a significant body of public opinion in the United States against South Africa, you continue to recognize the South African Ambassador. I will close with that statement, Mr. Chairman.

CARIBBEAN BASIN INITIATIVE

Mr. **Barnes.** Mr. Bosworth, as you know, a number of us are trying to round up votes for the Caribbean Basin initiative, and you have not given us much optimism this afternoon that we are going to be able to sway some of our colleagues who are concerned about what they regard as the exclusion of Grenada from any participation in the CBI.

What about the possibility of some aid directly to the private sector in Grenada?

Mr. **Bosworth.** We are prepared to do that, Mr. Chairman. In fact, AID is currently designing a project, which would be a multilaterally organized project within the eastern Caribbean, under which aid would be provided to the private sector of Grenada. It is our hope that that project will go forward.

NO UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD GRENADA

Mr. **Barnes.** I said at the outset, in my opening comments, that I am not sure what the United States policy toward Grenada ought to be. It seems to me, based upon your testimony and the testimony of our colleagues that we heard earlier, that my judgment is confirmed—we don't really have a policy right now. We sort of have a policy of not having a policy. I must say I regard it as a difficult posture to accept.

Grenada is a country, the population of which is about one-fifth of the congressional district of any one of the four of us sitting up here. There are about 110,000 in Grenada, and I have got close to 600,000 people that I represent around here in Montgomery County. Its principal export, as I understand it, is nutmeg.

It is not a tremendous threat to the security of the United States. It seems to me that we ought to be able to deal with its existence in a manner that is somewhat more realistic than what has been demonstrated to date by the administration's policy.

I would hope that based on the comments of our colleagues and of the other testimony that we will hear, that you and your colleagues in the State Department who have to deal with this question on a daily basis would at least take another look at whether there is a way that the United States and Grenada can deal with each other in a more normal and responsible manner.

We thank you very much for taking the time and trouble to prepare your testimony. You are always welcome before the subcommittee. We thank you again for being here.

Mr. **Bosworth**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Barnes**. Now we will welcome our two final witnesses, the Honorable Sally Shelton, former Ambassador to the eastern Caribbean, and presently a fellow at the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University; and Mr. Randall Robinson, executive director of TransAfrica.

Ambassador Shelton, welcome to the subcommittee. We look forward to hearing your testimony and that of Mr. Robinson.

STATEMENT OF HON. SALLY A. SHELTON, FORMER U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE EASTERN CARIBBEAN AND FELLOW, CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Ms. **Shelton**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In the interest of time, and with your permission, I would like to condense a couple of paragraphs, primarily those relating to the economic situation in Grenada, since they have been touched on by prior witnesses.

I am currently at Harvard University where I am researching and writing about the particular problems of the small island nations of the eastern Caribbean, including Grenada. As you pointed out earlier, I was the American Ambassador to Grenada from 1979 to 1981, a period during which there was considerable change in the internal political situation of that country, as well as in United States-Grenada relations.

Earlier this year, I made a brief return trip to Grenada, and during that time I had several discussions with a broad cross-section of Grenadians. So I would like to draw on my impressions of that trip, as well as my earlier experience as Ambassador, to share with you some thoughts and comments relative to the current situation in Grenada, U.S. policy, and some suggestions for policy changes.

ECONOMIC CLIMATE IN GRENADA

Mr. Chairman, Grenada is a very small island of approximately 110,000 people. Its per capita income is about $600 per annum, one of the lowest in the hemisphere. Its gross national product is not much more than 61 million U.S. dollars a year. Its natural resources are limited to spectacular beaches and tropical fruits.

It has traditionally been one of the poorer countries in the Caribbean and continues to be. Its rate of economic growth is exceedingly low, averaging barely 2 percent per year. It suffers from about a 20-percent rate of inflation. Unemployment probably reaches up to 25 percent of the work force and is most likely double that among the young, who comprise probably one-half of the population of Grenada.

Trade deficits are widening dramatically, as Ambassador Bosworth has already indicated. The prices of all imports are going up, while the prices of Grenada's basic commodity exports are remaining stagnant or, in some cases, are declining.

This deteriorating economic situation in Grenada is similar to that of much of the rest of the Caribbean, and indeed is an illustration of how urgently needed the administration's proposed Caribbean Basin initiative is.

POLITICAL SITUATION IN GRENADA

But it is the political situation in Grenada which sets it apart from most of the rest of the Caribbean. The revolution of March 13, 1979, was a watershed in Grenada's political history and has resulted in a substantially altered political system and foreign policy.

To understand the origins of the Grenada revolution, I think it is worth taking a minute or two to understand the extent of abuse of the so-called democratic system under the prior Prime Minister, Sir Eric Gairy, who was deposed in the 1979 coup.

Gairy is widely believed to have been personally corrupt and to have ignored both the letter and the spirit of constitutional procedures. Allegations have been made that the election in Grenada, that of 1976, may very well have been rigged.

Gairy and his personal group of thugs, the so-called Mongoose Gang, were probably responsible for deaths of certain opposition political figures, among them the father of the present Prime Minister, as well as for vicious beatings of other opposition leaders, among whom figure two members of the current Cabinet, including Prime Minister Maurice Bishop.

There is no question that Gairy, whose highest priority was the establishment of the United Nations Commission To Investigate Unidentified Flying Objects, was a blemish not only on the face of Grenada, but also on the Caribbean. Very few mourn Gairy's departure, which was probably a blessing for Grenada. It is unfortunate that his removal was by extraconstitutional means but, let's face it, this was probably the only way he would have gone.

When the 1979 revolution occurred, the people of the Caribbean, and many elsewhere, breathed a sigh of relief that Gairy was gone. Many held great expectations, strengthened by statements by the new leadership, the New Jewel Movement, that the trappings of democracy under Gairy would be replaced by a true democratic system and socioeconomic reform. Prime Minister Bishop himself promised prompt national elections and committed himself to improving the conditions of life for the Grenadian people.

Some of these great expectations have been dashed, and some have been fulfilled. Permit me now to turn to a description of how I see things in Grenada.

After taking power, the New Jewel Movement promptly suspended the constitution and the parliament, detained without trial a number of Grenadians considered threats to the security of the state, and closed down the Torchlight, the island's only independent newspaper.

Soon afterward, an opposition political party's attempt to hold a political rally was broken up by NJM stalwarts. This, combined with the detention without trial of various opposition leaders, has successfully coerced the opposition into silence.

Political detainees today probably number about 100, as Ambassador Bosworth indicated. Many have been held for the entire 3-year period of the revolution without trial. Some allegations, specifically by the Trinidad Human Rights Commission, have been made of small-scale torture, allegations denied by the Grenada Government.

Private citizens who have dared to speak out in favor of elections and to question the detentions and the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus have been subjected to both petty and serious embarrassment. Attempts to establish a new independent newspaper have been stifled by government intervention.

DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

The Grenada Government has declined to hold elections, pleading the need for time to write a new constitution. Although 3 years have passed, no apparent progress has been made on even setting up a panel to begin studying alternative constitutional models.

Though the Grenada political system is obviously still evolving, and I believe it is important to bear this in mind, at this time Grenada appears to have become a one-party state. This situation, of course, is analogous to that of many developing countries, some being geographically and politically very close to the United States. It is a one-party system extremely sensitive to criticism both from within and from abroad, and whose level of tolerance for the expression of dissenting views is fairly low.

ECONOMIC GROWTH IN GRENADA

To turn now to the economic situation in Grenada, Mr. Chairman, as I have pointed out in the beginning of my testimony, economic growth and development in Grenada have traditionally lagged behind the rest of the Caribbean. Though this is still the case, there is some evidence to indicate that some progress is occurring.

Perhaps one of the most striking successes of the Grenada revolution so far has been the significant improvement in the administration of the government and the apparent cleaning out of corruption. Longstanding foreign debts are being paid off and the government is widely credited with being one of the most efficiently run in the Caribbean It has succeeded in attracting back a number of Grenadian technicians living abroad, a notable achievement in an area where technical expertise is seriously lacking and is a major impediment to the development process.

On other fronts, results have been mixed. Traditional buoyancy in the agricultural sector, one of the pillars of the Grenadian economy—in fact it accounts for roughly one-third of the GDP and employs one-third of Grenada's work force—appears still to be the case, though somewhat moderated by the development of an artificial substitute for nutmeg, Grenada's main export commodity.

The private sector is stagnant as a result both of international recession and a loss of investor confidence. Tourism is sluggish as well, again due to the international recession in the United States and Europe, as well as to Grenada's image problem abroad.

Official Grenada Government sources claim to have created several hundred new jobs since the revolution. Since there has probably been no significant new investment in the private sector, these new jobs, if they exist and I have no reason to doubt that they exist, probably can be found in public sector projects. Indeed, it is in the area of public sector investment that the most concrete evidence of progress under the revolution can be observed.

The most dramatic example is the construction of a new international airport to facilitate expansion of tourism, the other pillar of Grenada's economy. If I might just add, Mr. Chairman, every small island in the eastern Caribbean would give its eyeteeth to have Grenada's new international airport.

In addition, the Grenada Government has built two modest agricultural processing plants and has expanded programs in housing, health, education, fisheries, road construction, and agricultural production.

It is my view, Mr. Chairman, that the Grenada Government is indeed committed to social and ecnomic reform in Grenada. It must be recognized that progress in these areas has been made and Grenada is on the way to catching up with the general level of social and economic development of the rest of the eastern Caribbean.

The efforts of the Grenada Government to this end should be applauded though I am sure that those who support efforts to meet the economic and social rights of the people would also applaud efforts to heed their political rights as well.

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD GRENADA

Let us now turn to United States policy toward Grenada. Mr. Chairman, since I am a mere private citizen, I wish to emphasize that the following description of U.S. policy is my own perception of that policy and should not be considered as an official intepretation of United States policy toward Grenada.

I intend to be frank. United States-Grenada relations have deteriorated substantially since the March 1979 revolution. I believe both sides are to blame. There have been misperceptions, misunderstandings, and there has not been goodwill. But for the moment at least let us focus on the present state of U.S. policy.

I am convinced that the U.S. Government would like to have good relations with the People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada but does not believe that is possible under the present circumstances. From the present U.S. administration's perspective, I see three major problems: One, Grenada's close relationship to Cuba; two, the Grenada Government's virulent anti-United States rhetoric; and three, Grenada's behavior at the OAS and the U.N.

I suspect the poor human rights situation in Grenada does not trouble the present U.S. administration as it did its predecessor. How could an administration which calls for consistency in foreign policy, and which tends to gloss over human rights abuses in Argentina, El Salvador, and Guatemala, fail to gloss over them in Grenada as well?

UNITED STATES ATTEMPTS TO DISTANCE ITSELF FROM GRENADA

The present U.S. administration appears to have continued its predecessor's policy of distancing itself from Grenada, but to have gone a step further by seeking to isolate Grenada. This has been done by efforts to:

(a) To prevent Grenada from benefiting from certain U.S. AID projects channeled through the Caribbean Development Bank;

(b) To deny Grenada technical assistance and disaster relief made available to other islands;

(c) To refuse to accredit a U.S. Ambassador to Grenada and to refuse to accept the accreditation of a Grenadian Ambassador to the United States;

(d) To avoid discussions of bilateral problems with Grenadian Government officials.

ALLEGATIONS OF UNITED STATES COVERT ACTION AGAINST GRENADA

Mr. Chairman, I categorically reject the charges by the Grenada Government, charges which are central to the deterioration in relations between the two countries, of U.S. efforts under the previous administration to destabilize the Government of Grenada. That is utter nonsense.

I believe that it is also erroneous to charge, as Prime Minister Bishop does, that there is a U.S.-imposed undeclared blockade against Grenada under the present administration. I do believe, however, that the present administration's strategy of trying to isolate Grenada is shortsighted, petulant, and based on erroneous assumptions.

"CUBA-PHOBIA"

Our policy toward the Caribbean has traditionally been shaped to a substantial degree to our Cuba-phobia. We have generally found it difficult to have friendly and constructive relations with countries which, in turn, have close ties to Cuba. Grenada is a case in point.

Although we profess our support for social and economic development in the Third World, a support that is real and sincere, we do not believe that Cuba has the right to provide aid to that end.

Although Grenada's need in the areas of health, education, housing, and public infrastructure are considerable and urgent, we are bothered by the presence of Cuban doctors, teachers, agronomists, and engineers—the very kind of technical assistance we ourselves should be providing, I might add.

Cuba is an integral part of the Caribbean. If we learned nothing else from years of attempting to isolate China, we learned that isolation as a policy tool does not work. We have far more to gain from talking with people than from ignoring them; this goes for Cuba as well as for Grenada.

GRENADA'S TIES TO THE WEST

Another errorneous assumption is that Grenada is irrevocably lost to the West. Although I myself am not sanguine about the prospects for the establishment of a democratic system in Grenada, we should not assume as many do that Grenada is irrevocably and tightly bound to Cuba and the Soviet bloc. Those countries have demonstrated time and again that, except for Cuban technical assistance, they are not in a position to give developing countries, including Grenada, what they need—capital and access to markets.

Grenada's trade is overwhelmingly tied to the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, and its Caricom neighbors. Only the West can provide it with the capital and markets it needs for expanding its productive sector and financing its ambitious and laudable social and economic development programs.

I would point out that Cuba is not the sole benefactor of Grenada, or radical Arab countries for that matter. Mexico, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the European Economic Community among others have important aid programs underway there.

GRENADA'S ANTI-AMERICAN RHETORIC

I believe the U.S. Government is justified in being concerned about the anti-American rhetoric emanating from St. George's. Even though you may be the most powerful nation on earth, it is annoying to be constantly blasted, at times almost daily, with all the evils of the world.

Rhetoric blaming the United States for everything from the repressed plight of women around the world to a power shortage in Grenada attributes to the U.S. Government an omnipotence it does not have and calls into question the Grenada Government's professed desire for good relations with us.

I believe the U.S. Government is also right to be concerned at certain aspects of Grenada's role in international organizations, especially its vote against the U.N. condemnation of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

The United States is making a serious mistake, Mr. Chairman, by seeking to isolate Grenada. By doing so, it only closes the door to the possibilities for a constructive working relationship and drives Grenada that much more into the arms of its Cuban benefactors.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

I would like to suggest a few changes in U.S. policy, changes which might not succeed in improving the climate of relations, but which at least should be tried. At the very least, they would test the Grenada Government's professed interest in better relations; at most they might produce a measure of improvement in our bilateral relationship.

You have already quoted from my testimony, but very briefly.

We should accredit an Ambassador to Grenada, and we should accept accreditation of a Grenadian Ambassador to this country. I might add that our Ambassador to Grenada should not be encumbered, as I was, with restrictions on his or her ability to travel to Grenada.

Second, we should meet at an appropriately high level with representatives of the Government of Granada to discuss the outstanding issues, misperceptions, and misunderstandings that have brought our relationship to its current low level.

Third, we should refrain from seeking to isolate Grenada by denying it technical, disaster, and project assistance. We should be prepared for a time to support the Grenada Government's efforts to improve the economic plight of their people and we should make clear our hope that elections will be held, that political prisoners will be released, and that freedom of speech will be respected. If, after an appropriate period of time, human rights problems and intolerance of dissent continue, then the U.S. Government should reassess its assistance.

Last, the U.S. Government should refrain from provocative military maneuvers in Caribbean waters. We can achieve our goals far more easily and effectively by stressing our respect for the national sovereignty of the nations of the Caribbean by supporting their economic development than by revival of an obsolete policy of gunboat diplomacy.

In the specific case of Grenada, Mr. Chairman, to conclude, our phobia toward and obsession with this small island is hardly warranted. It is in my view incongruous that the most powerful nation on Earth should be so disturbed and so threatened by a small island of 110,000 people whose main export is nutmeg.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Ms. Shelton's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. SALLY A. SHELTON, FORMER U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE EASTERN CARIBBEAN

Mr. Chairman, my name is Sally Shelton. I am currently a Fellow at the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University where I am research and writing about the special problems of the Small Island Nations of the Eastern Caribbean, including Grenada. Prior to that, I was the U. S. Ambassador to Grenada from 1979-1981, a period during which there was considerable change in the internal political situation of that country as well as in U.S.-Grenada relations.

Earlier this year I made a brief, return trip to Grenada; during that visit I had several discussions with a broad cross-section of Grenadians. I would like to draw on my impressions of that trip, as well as on my earlier experience as Ambassador, to share with you some thoughts and comments relative to the current situation in Grenada, U.S. policy, and some suggestions for policy changes. During my testimony, due to the shortness of time I will not go back in detail into the history of U.S.-Grenada relations since the 1979 Revolution but will certainly be happy to answer any questions you or other Sub-Committee Members might have in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, Grenada is a very small island of approximately 110,000 people; its per capita income level is approximately $600 (according to the World Bank) and the latest figures for its Gross National Product place it at $61.3 million. Its natural resources are limited to spectacular beaches and tropical fruits. It has traditionally been one of the poorer countries in the Caribbean and continues to be. Grenada's GDP rate of economic growth has averaged barely 2% or less in recent years; inflation is about 20%; and, although reliable data are not available, its rate of unemployment probably hovers around 25% of the work force, though double that among the young who comprise about one-half the population of Grenada. Birth rates are high though the real population increase has been tempered by.

substantial out-migration to metropolitan countries. Trade deficits are widening dramatically. The price of oil and worldwide inflation are raising the price of imported goods while prices of Grenada's few export commodities -- nutmeg, mace, bananas -- have remained stagnant and in some cases have actually declined.

The deteriorating economic situation in Grenada, Mr. Chairman, is similar to that of much of the rest of the Caribbean and indeed is an illustration of how urgently needed is the Administration's proposed Caribbean Basin Initiative now under consideration in the Congress. But it is the political situation in Grenada which sets it apart from most of the rest of the Caribbean. The Revolution of March 13, 1979 was a watershed in Grenada's history and has resulted in a substantially altered political system and foreign policy.

To understand the origins of the Grenada Revolution, and the subsequent development of the new Grenadian state, one must understand the extent of abuse of the democratic system by the prior Prime Minister, Sir Eric Gairy,
deposed in the 1979 coup. Gairy is widely believed

to have been personally corrupt and to have ignored both the letter and the spirit of constitutional procedures. Allegations have been made that the last election in Grenada, that of 1976, may well have been rigged. Gairy and his personal gang of thugs, the so-called Mongoose Gang, were probably responsible for deaths of certain opposition political figures (among them the father of the current Prime Minister) as well as for vicious beatings of other opposition leaders -- among whom figure two members of the current Government, including Prime Minister Maurice Bishop. There is no question that Gairy, whose highest priority was the establishment of a United Nations Commission to investigate Unidentified Flying Objects, was a blemish not only on the face of Grenada but also on the Caribbean.

Very few mourn Gairy's departure which was probably a blessing for Grenada. It is unfortunate that his removal was by extra-constitutional means but let's face it -- that was probably the only way he would have gone.

When the 1979 Revolution occurred, the Caribbean (and many elsewhere) breathed a sigh of relief that Gairy was gone. Many held great expectations, strengthened by statements by the new leadership (the New Jewel Movement), that the trappings of democracy under Gairy would be replaced by a true democratic system and socioeconomic reform. Prime Minister Bishop himself promised prompt national elections and committed himself to improving the conditions of life of the Grenadian people.

Some of the great expectations have been dashed and some have been fulfilled. Permit me to turn now to a description of how I see things in Grenada.

After taking power, the New Jewel Movement promptly suspended the Constitution, the Parliament, detained without trial a numberof Grenadians considered threats to the securityof the state, and closed down the Torchlight, the island's only independent newspaper. Soon afterwards, an opposition political party's attempt to hold a political rally was broken up by NJM stalwarts; this, combined with the detention without trial of various opposition leaders, has successfully coerced the opposition into silence.

Political detainees today probably number about 100 ; many have been held for the entire three-year-plus period of the Revolution without trial. Some allegations, specifically by the Trinidad Human Rights Commisssion, have been made of small-scale torture, allegations denied by the Grenada Government. Private citizens who havedared to speak out in favor of elections and to question the detentions and the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus have been subjected to both petty and serious harrassment. Attempts to establish a new independent newspaper were stifled by government intervention. The Grenada Government has declined to hold elections, pleading the need for time to write a new Constitution. Although three years have passed, no apparent progress has been made on even setting upa panel to begin studying alternative constitutional models.

Though the Grenada political system is obviously still evolving, at this time Grenada appears to have become a one-party state. This situation, of course, is analogous to that of many developing countries, some being geographically and politically very close to us. It is a one-party system extremely sensitive to criticism, both from within and from abroad, and whose level of tolerance for the expression of dissenting views is fairly low.

To turn now to the economic situation in Grenada, Mr. Chairman: as I pointed out in the beginning of my remarks, economic growth and development in Grenada have traditionally lagged behindthe rest of the Caribbean. Though this is still the case, there is some evidence to indicate that some progress is occurring. Perhaps one of the most striking successes of the Grenada Revolution so far has been the significant improvement in the administration of the government and the apparent cleaning outof corruption. Long-standing foreign debts are being paid off and the Government is widely credited with being one of the most efficiently-run in the Caribbean. It has succeeded in attracting back a number of Grenadian technicians living abroad, a notable achievement in an area where technical expertise is seriously lacking and is a major impediment to the development process.

On other fronts, results have been mixed. Traditional buoyancy in the agricultural sector, one of the pillars of the Grenadian economy (accounting for one-third of GDP and employing one-third of the work force) appears still to be the case, though somewhat moderated by the development of an artificial substitute for nutmeg, Grenada's main export commodity. The private sector is stagnant, as a result both of international recession and a loss of investor confidence. Tourism is sluggish as well, again due to the international recession as well as to Grenada's image problem abroad.

Official Grenada Government sources claim to have created several hundred new jobs since the revolution. Since there has probably been no significant new investment in the private sector since the Revolution, these new jobs, if they exist, probably can be found in public sector projects, It is in the area of public sector investment, Mr. Chairman, that the most concrete evidence of progress under the Revolution can be observed. The most dramatic example is the construction of an expensive new international airport to facilitate expansion of tourism, the other pillar of Grenada's economy. In addition, the Grenada Government has built two modest agricultural processing plants and has expanded programs in housing, health, education, fisheries, road construction and agricultural production.

It is my view, Mr. Chairman, that the Grenada Government is indeed committed to social and economic reform in Grenada. It must be recognized that progress in these areas has been made and Grenada is on the way to catching up with the general level of social and economic development of the rest of the Eastern Caribbean. The efforts of the Grenada Government to this end should be applauded though I am sure that whose who support efforts to meet the economic and social rights of the people would also applaud efforts to heed their political rights as well.

Let us turn now to U.S. policy towards Grenada. Mr. Chairman, since I am a mere private citizen, I wish to emphasize that the following description of U.S. policy is my own perception of that policy and should not be considered as an official interpretation of U.S. policy towards Grenada. That would more appropriately be presented by a representative of the U. S. Government.

I intend to be frank, Mr. Chairman. U.S.-Grenada relations have deteriorated substantially since the March 1979 Revolution. I believe both sides are to blame. There have been misperceptions, mis-understandings and there has not always been good will. But for the moment at least let us focus on the present state of U.S. policy.

I am convinced that the U.S. Government would like to have good relations with the People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada but does not believe that is possible under the present circumstances. From the present U.S. Administration's perspective, I see three major problems: (1) Grenada's close relationship to

Cuba; (2) the Grenada Government's virulent anti-U.S. rhetoric; and (3) Grenada's behavior at the OAS and the UN. I suspect the poor human rights situation in Grenada does not trouble the present U.S. Administration as it did its predecessor. How could an Administration which calls for consistency in foreign policy and which tends to gloss over human rights abuses in Argentina, El Salvador and Guatemala fail to gloss over them in Grenada as well?'

The present U.S. Administration appears to have continued its predecessor's policy of distancing itself from Grenada but to have gone a step further by seeking to isolate Grenada. This has been done by efforts (a) to prevent Grenada from benefitting from certain U.S. AID projects channeled through the Caribbean Development Bank; (b) to deny Grenada technical assistance and disaster relief made available to other islands; (c) to refuse to accredit a U. S. Ambassador to Grenada and to refuse to accept the accreditation of a Grenadian Ambassador to the U.S.; (d) to avoid discussions of bilateral problems with Grenadian Government officials.

Mr. Chairman, I categorically reject the charges by the Grenada Government, charges which are central to the deterioration in relations between the two countries, of U.S. efforts under the previous U.S. Administration to destabilize the Government of Grenada. That is utter nonsense. I believe it is also erroneous to charge, as Prime Minister Bishop does, that there is a U.S.-imposed "undeclared blockade" against Grenada under the present Administration. I do believe, however, that the present Administration's strategy of trying to isolate Grenada is short-sighted, petulant and based on erroneous assumptions.

Our policy towards the Caribbean has traditionally been shaped to a substantial degree by our Cuba-phobia. We have generally found it difficult to have friendly and constructive relations with countries which in turn have close ties to Cuba. Grenada is a case in point. Although we profess our support for social and economic development in the Third World, a support which is real and sincere, we do not believe that Cuba has the right to provide aid to that end. Although Grenada's needs in the areas of health, education, housing, and public infrastructure are considerable and urgent, we are bothered by the presence of Cuban doctors, teachers, agronomists and engineers -- the kind of technical assistance we should be providing, I might add. Cuba is an integral part of the Caribbean; if we learned nothing else from years of attempting to isolate China, we learned that isolation as a policy tool does not work. We have far more to gain from talking with people than from ignoring them; this goes for Cuba as well as for Grenada.

Another erroneous assumption is that Grenada is irrevocably lost to "the West." Although I myself am not sanguine about the prospects for the establishment of a democratic system in Grenada, we should not assume as many do that Grenada is irrevocably and tightly bound to Cuba and the Soviet bloc. Those countries have demonstrated time and again that, except for Cuban technical assistance, they are not in a position to give developing countries, including Grenada, what they need: capital and access to markets. Grenada's trade is overwhelmingly tied to the U.K., the U.S., Canada and its CARICOM neighbors. Only the West can provide it with the capital and markets it needs for expanding its productive sector and financing its ambitious social and economic development programs. And I would point out that Cuba is not the sole benefactor of Grenada; Mexico, Canada, the U.K. and the European Economic Community among others have importnat aid programs underway there.

I believe the U.S. Government is justified in being concerned about the anti-American rhetoric emanating from St. George's. Even though you may be the most powerful nation on earth, it is annoying to be constantly blasted, at times almost daily, for all the evils of the world. Rhetoric blaming the U.S. for everything from the repressed plight of women around the world to a power shortage in Grenada attributes to the U.S. Government an omnipotence it does not have and calls into question the Grenada Government's professed desire for good relations with us.

I believe the U.S. Government is also right to be concerned at certain aspects of Grenada's role in international organizations, especially its vote against the U.N. condemnation of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (the only country in the hemisphere besides Cuba to vote with the U.S.S.R.).

The U.S. is making a serious mistake, Mr. Chairman, by seeking to isolate Grenada. By doing so it only closes the door to the possibilities for a constructive working relationship and drives Grenada that much more into the arms of its Cuban benefactors. I would like to suggest a few changes in U.S. policy, changes which might not succeed in improving the climate of relations but which at least should be tried. At the very least they would test the Grenada Government's professed interest in better relations; at most they might produce a measure of improvement in our bilateral relationship.

Mr. **Barnes**. Thank you very much, Ambassador Shelton.

Mr. Robinson, we welcome you to the subcommittee.

STATEMENT OF RANDALL ROBINSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, TRANSAFRICA

Mr. **Robinson**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would ask the Chair for permission to insert my full statement in the record.

Mr. **Barnes**. It will be included in the record in total.

Mr. **Robinson**. I will read a much shortened version of the statement.

I welcome this opportunity to testify on the topic of United States-Grenada relations. I represent TransAfrica, a black-American lobby for Africa and the Caribbean. Our organization advocates the adoption of more enlightened U.S. policies toward these aforementioned regions.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD GRENADA

For too long U.S. foreign policy and policymakers have been obsessed with the fear of communism, overlooking the primary causes of tension and instability in the developing world. In the case of Grenada, we see more of a U.S. concern with combating expanding Soviet/Cuban influence than respecting the basic integrity and legitimacy of a truly popular revolution.

In the past 3 years, the new government has initiated a bold experiment in participatory democracy, representing an alternative model for change in the region. Despite the impressive strides in social and economic development in the face of formidable odds, the U.S. Government views Grenada with unwarranted suspicion, maintains nominal diplomatic relations, and engages in a deliberate campaign of economic subversion.

This testimony seeks to highlight the internal conditions in Grenada, fault U.S. policy, and suggest immediate changes in U.S. policy toward that island.

INITIATIVES OF NEW JEWEL MOVEMENT

The overthrow of the Gairy regime on March 13, 1979, came in response to 28 years of gross economic mismanagement, pervasive corruption, consistent human rights violations, and censorship of opposition parties. Since 1979, the new government has undertaken a wide change of political, economic, and social reforms which have dramatically improved conditions particularly for poor people. Some of the improvements include: Free milk and hot lunches for primary school children; free medical care; opening of a $1 million agroindustrial processing plant; significant infrastructure improvements; formation of numerous cooperatives and land reform.

POPULAR DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION

Beyond the increased social welfare spending and capital investment, the New Jewel Movement has moved to diffuse political power, encourage broad participation, and engender a strong spirit of communalism and national pride. From the embryo of a clandestine organization, the New Jewel Movement has grown into a mass-base political party.

In the spring of 1981, the government decided to open membership in the party to support groups and mass organizations, to all of those who supported the revolution. As a result, the existing organs of popular democracy, the parish councils, were further decentralized. Zonal councils or assemblies for clusters of villages within each of the seven parishes were instituted.

Simultaneously, parallel structures for each of the major interest groups—workers, farmers, women, and youth—were established. These mass organizations meet regularly at the parish level, have a nationwide coordinating committee and an elected body of national officers.

These organizations not only press for their own interests, but also serve as mobilizers for national projects. For example, the National Women's Organization, with its 161 local and 8,000 members in the last 2 years, has spearheaded the repair and painting of all primary schools and the creation of a number of day care centers, bakeries, and nurseries.

The purpose of all of these structures is to provide formal and regular interaction between the Grenadian people and the government.

At a typical zonal and parish council meeting, a member of the cabinet and one or more senior level government officials are present to report, to listen, and to answer questions about current policies, implementation of programs, and specific grievances.

Beyond accountability, the meeting serves as a channel for popular input into the legislative process. The maternity leave law, for example, was not passed in final form until every organized body with a remote interest had offered its comments and criticisms of the draft.

On the negative side, some have faulted the Grenadian Government for not holding elections and drafting a new constitution. The government has also been criticized for suppressing dissident press, detention without charges of about 100 political prisoners, and harrassment of conservative labor union leaders. Many of these criticisms are not taken in the context of the highly fluid political environment wherein the government holds legitimate security fears.

The Allende regime was toppled by malicious propaganda, externally instigated labor strikes, and financial strangulation. Scandalous news stories in the censored Torchlight, a bomb blast had missed maiming or killing the entire Jewel leadership and a series of hostile U.S. actions give reason and cause for Grenadian Government alarm.

The government has made a commitment to draft a constitution and hold elections after a period of consolidation after the new institutions become more formalized and the confidence of the people enlarged.

DETENTION OF POLITICAL PRISONERS

In regard to the detention of political prisoners without charge, an area of genuine concern exists. The situation, though, is improving. Recently, 40 detainees were arraigned and 7 tried. Scarcity of lawyers and a full-fledged constitution are part of the problem.

Nevertheless, an investigation of general political conditions by the Press Association of Jamaica in February 1982 concluded that "Reports of torture, denial of medical treatment to the detainees, and the general charge of systematic repression of opponents appears to us to be baseless and misleading."

In the economic realm, the performance of Grenada has been remarkable given the world recession, falling prices for its traditional exports—nutmeg, cocoa, banana, and mace—high internal rates of inflation and unemployment, and U.S. economic aggression.

ECONOMIC SITUATION

The report on the national economy for 1981 and prospects for 1982 indicates that real gross domestic products rose by 2 percent in 1981. The main economic focus of the Grenadian Government is a reconstruction of the basic infrastructure and the stimulation of the agricultural sector.

In the last 2 years, there has been a tremendous increase in capital investment by the public sector, 34 percent and 68.3 percent respectively. Besides the construction and infrastructure repair, agricultural output has expanded. Food crop production increased by 10 percent, the fish catch improved significantly, and exports diversified. Plans are now underway to market locally produced coffee and cocoa products in another attempt to strengthen the domestic economy and replace extensive imports.

The problematic areas, however, encompass nagging trade and budget deficits, as well as a lack of spare parts for machinery and a generally aged capital stock. Like most Third World countries, the terms of trade have continued to deteriorate. In 1981, the food and oil import bills were particularly large—$30 million. The deficit in that year was $40.2 million, up from $33 million in 1980. Internally, the recurrent expenditure account continues to outstrip the recurrent revenue. For 1982, new taxes are proposed and spending cuts have been made.

The most troubled area of the economy is the tourist sector. Arrivals and revenues have dropped substantially in the last year due to a variety of factors—the deep recession in America and Europe, the inconvenient air connections, the negative publicity, and a devastating hotel fire. Nevertheless, the government has pledged to resuscitate this sector, and a major study is now underway as to how to best attract the tourists to the island.

UNITED STATES HOSTILITY TOWARD GRENADA

Although Grenada is a tiny island, whose government is seriously committed to egalitarian development and many of the same democratic principles cherished by Americans, the previous and present U.S. administrations, in attempts to reassert American dominance in the region, have singled out Grenada for hostile treatment.

U.S. policymakers have erroneously subordinated the Grenadian people's right to self-determination to East-West geopolitical considerations. Despite the setback in Vietnam, U.S. leaders still believe that they can impose our model of political economy on others, or at the very least exert appreciable control over the process of change in the Third World, so as to serve our own selfish ends.

Grenada is emerging as yet another futile exercise in global policing. Since the overthrow of the corrupt, yet pro-American Eric Gairy, both the Carter and Reagan administrations have sought to isolate and economically strangle the Government of Grenada.

Starting with the message of Frank Ortiz, the Ambassador to the eastern Caribbean under President Carter, stating that the United States would view with displeasure any acceptance of Cuban aid, the U.S. Government has gone on to refuse to accept the credentials from two different Grenadian Ambassadors, to block IMF and World Bank loans, to openly attempt to dissuade EEC donors from pledging moneys for construction of Grenada's 9,000-foot international airport, to set conditions on a grant to the Caribbean Development Bank excluding Grenada, and to assail Grenada for a lack of democracy and for intending to spread the virus of Marxism among its neighbors.

The Grenadian Government, on the other hand, has made numerous overtures to the U.S. Government to hold talks and to establish cordial relations. Repeatedly, Prime Minister Bishop has pledged his nation to mutual cooperation, noninterference, and peaceful coexistence.

To date, there are no indications of attempts to subvert nearby states, or significant militarization. No U.S. interests or residents have been directly threatened by expropriation or personal injury. In light of these Grenadian actions, the U.S. response seems totally unreasoned and unjustified.

POLICY ALTERNATIVES

In this era of political and economic nationalism, the Caribbean is no one's backyard. We should be supporting the efforts of the Grenadian people in fashioning new and open democratic structures. It is a bold experiment, it is not a perversity as the Reagan administration would like us to believe.

We propose that a superior U.S. foreign policy stance would be predicated on ideological pluralism, constructive dialog, and mutual cooperation. We specifically suggest the following changes:

One, A cessation of U.S. hostilities toward Grenada in both the diplomatic and the economic spheres;

Two, Immediate undertaking of high-level talks between the governments as a first step in a new full and cordial diplomatic relationship;

Three, Inclusion of Grenada in the Caribbean Basin initiative and the extension of substantial bilateral economic assistance; and

Four, Cooperation in the extradition of Eric Gairy, the former Prime Minister.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. Robinson's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RANDALL ROBINSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, TRANSAFRICA

Mr. Chairman, and other members of the Committee, I welcome this opprotunity to testify today on US-Grenada relations. I represent TransAfrica, a black American foreign policy lobby for Africa and the Caribbean. Our organization advocates the adoption of more sensitive and enlightened policies toward nations in the aforementioned regions.

In the southern tip of the Caribbean archipelago lies the island of Grenada. This small island state. roughly 21 miles long by 10 miles wide (120 sq. mi.), supports a population of 110,000 primarily through the export of tropical agricultural products and the inflow of tourist dollars.

Grenada shares the same legacy of many other Caribbean states: extermination of indigenous populations, introduction of African slavery, several changes in colonial rules, heavy dependence on sugar, sporadic uprisings, and economic stagnation since the early 19th century. Since emancipation, small scale farming has become a dominant feature. Widespread poverty and high underemployment and unemployment, however, have been cruel realities.

From 1951 to 1979, Grenadians suffered dearly under the corrupt and repressive dictatorship of Eric Gairy, who became the first Prime Minister when Grenada gained independence from Britain in 1974. On March 14, 1979, the popularly based New Jewel Movement (NJM) overthrew Gairy and formed the Peoples' Revolutionary Government (PRG). In the past three years the PRG had initiated a bold experiment in participatory democracy, presenting an alternative model for change in the region. Despite the impressive strides in social and economic development in the face of formidable odds, the US Government views Grenada with unwarranted suspicion, maintains nominal diplomatic relations, and engages in a deliberate campaign of economic subversion. This testimony will highlight the internal conditions of Grenada, fault US policy, and suggest immediate changes in the US stance vis a vis that island state.

INTERNAL CONDITIONS

The overthrow of the Gairy regime came in response to 28 years of gross economic mismanagement, pervasive corruption, consistent human rights violations, and censorship of opposition parties. The New Jewel Movement (JEWEL: Joint Endeavor for Welfare, Education and Liberation), a mass based opposition party formed in 1973, increasingly challenged the Gairy regime in the intervening years through elections, worker strikes, and street demonstrations. Many of the leaders were detained and tortured and a few died at the hands of the police and the "Mongoose Gang", Gairy's private army.

On the morning of the revolution, thousands heeded the call to arms broadcasted over the captured radio station and rushed out to surround and demand the surrender of Gairy's police and military forces. Only three persons lost their lives.

Since taking power, the Peoples' Revolutionary Government has taken a wide range of political, economic and social reforms which have dramatically improved conditions, particularly [illegible]~~he~~ poorer class. Some of the improvements include:

Social Services

* Dental clinics have been established in all parishes (7) as opposed to one before the revolution and the first eye clinic has opened.

* Free milk and hot lunches are provided for primary school children.

* Secondary school fees were reduced in 1980 from $37.50 per term to $12.50 and university scholarships rose from three in 1978 to 209 in 1981.

* Volunteer teachers of the Centre for Popular Education have launched a nation-wide literacy campaign.

* The number of returning Grenadian professionals has been encouraging especially in the medical field. Before the revolution there were only eight medical doctors, now there are 39 thanks to returning nationals and Cuban personnel.

* Medical care is free in all public health clinics and hospitals.

* The Mireaubeau Agricultural school has been upgraded and expanded and a new secondary school built, the first governmental one in decades.

  Three community centers, built by volunteer labor, have opened and others are under construction.

AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES, TOURISM

* A $1 million Agro-Industrial plant opened, preparing and canning fruits, juices, vegetables, and preserves for both internal consumption and export. Lettuce, grapefruit, oranges, eggplant, and mangoes are some of the new export commodities prepared or packaged at the plant.

* The National Cooperative Development Agency (NACDA) has been instrumental in starting 23 new cooperatives in agriculture, handicrafts, and retailing. NACDA offers training seminars and facilitates access to credit and idle lands in conjunction with the National Commercial Bank, a national development bank, and the Land Reform Commission. As a result a significant number of youths have been employed and new acreage brought under cultivation.

* The National Fisheries Corporation, a state enterprise reponsible for providing modern equipment for fishermen, opened in April 1981 and in unison with the Fish Processing plant has markedly increased the fish catch, the protein intake of the population, and foreign exchange earnings from the sale of frozen and salted fish. The impressive jump in the fish catch is due principally to the introduction of seven modern trawlers, 6 of which were gifts from the Cuban Government.

* A survey is presently under way to develop the tourist industry. The private sector is actively engaged in the study. It is the goal of the Grenadian Government to resuscitate the sector.

* Construction of the 9,000 ft. international airport started in September 1979 and is 35% complete. The airport will accomodate direct jumbo jet service from the US and Europe, bolstering the tourist sector and the island's ability to export local products faster, especially perishable goods.

* The Ministry of Planning and Finance opened a computer center and trained five persons to operate the center. The computer

will be of great assistance in the development of an up-to-date statistical base on the society.

- Two water treatment plants have been recently opened increasing the supply of safe water.

(1.1) SALIENT POLITICAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

The New Jewel Movement has moved to diffuse political power, encourage broad participation, engender a strong spirit of communalism and national identification. From the embryo of a clandestine network of councils scattered across the country under the repressive Gairy regime, the New Jewel Movement has grown into a mass based political party.

In the spring of 1981, the government decided to open membership in the party support groups and the mass organizations to all supporters of revolution. As a result of the opening, the established organs of popular democracy, the Parish Councils, were inundated with hew comers. Dating back to 1978, the NJM held monthly meetings in each of Grenada's seven parishes or political subdivisions. The meetings continued after the revolution and served as a forum for dialogue between the leadership and the people. As participation swelled in the Parish Councils, the party leadership decided to further decentralize the political process and institute Zonal Councils in each of the seven parishes. Each Zonal Council would center around a cluster of villages and function the same way as the Parish Council. Simultaneously, the NJM established parallel structures for each of the major interest groups: workers, independent farmers, women, and youth. These mass organizations meet regularly at the parish level, have a nation-wide coordinating committee, and an elected body of national officers. The organizations serve primarily as pressure groups for their own interests and mobilizers for projects of national import. For example, the National Women's Organization (NWO) with its 161 locals, sponsors, leadership training seminars for women, presses for educational and marketplace advancements, and engages in community improvement. During the last two years, NWO spearheaded the repair and painting of all primary schools and the creation of a number of day care centers, bakeries, and nurseries.

The purpose of all these structures is to provide formal and regular interaction between Grenadian people and the government. The process is based on the principal of accountability: the political leadership and the officials in charge of government programs must face the citizens on a regular basis to account for their performance. At the typical Zonal and Parish Council meetings, a member of the PRG Cabinet and one or more managerial level government officials are present to report, to listen, and to answer questions about current policies, implementation of programs, and specific grievances or concerns of a local nature. For example, at a series of meetings of the St. George's Workers Parish Council attended by 500-800 people, government officials have candidly responded to questions about the road system, electric outages, poor telephone services, and price controls.

Beyond accountability, the meetings serve as a channel for popular input into the legislative process. The Maternity Leave Law, for example, was not passed in the final form until every organized body in the country with a remote interest had offered its comments and criticisms on the draft. With the expansion of the organs of popular democracy, the channels for such input are becoming more formalized. For instance, complaints raised at Zonal Council meetings about exploitative landlords and high rents spurred the Ministry of Legal Affairs to draft a proposed Rent Registration Act. The draft law was mass produced and distributed at subsequent meetings across the island for all to take home and discuss.

The boldest expression of democratization to date has been the extensive consultations with thousands of people in the mass organizations and a special conference on the economy in preparation of the budget. This past March, the government summarized the 1982 budget to the people of Grenada in Queen's Park.

Outsiders have faulted the Grenadian Government for not holding elections and drafting a new constitution, in short for abandoning the Westminister style of parliamentary democracy. The government has also been crticized for suspension of a free press, the detention without charges of about 60 political prisoners, and harassment of conservative, independent labor union officials. Many of these criticisms are not taken in the context of a highly fluid political environment wherein the government holds legitimate security fears. The Allende regime was toppled by externally instigated labor strikes and financial strangulation. US policies toward the island have been suspect if not hostile.

Unmistakenly the Grenadian Government has created a new sense of pride and determination in the people to improve their material lot. A new democracy is being fashioned, one along participatory lines. The evolving popular political organs and formal consultative procedures seem a vast improvement over the previous parliamentary form of government which limited popular participation to every five years, represented only the interests of the upper classes, and became a gross parody in the latter years of the Gairy regime.

The PRG had made a commitment to draft a constitution and hold elections after a period of consolidation, after the new institutions become more formalized and the confidence of the people in their own capabilities for self-government increase. We in the outside world and especially the US should be patient and supportive of Grenadian efforts. The detained persons are mostly former Gairy henchmen and some efforts are being taken to formally charge and try the detainees. Forty of an estimated 100 political prisoners have been charged. Reports of torture and beatings are uncomfirmed in both the State Department Country Reports and Amnesty International Human Rights Report for 1981. The suppression of the press is an area of genuine concern. But some credence has to be given the government's argument that some of the papers were engaging in unprofessional journalism and thereby undermining national security. What would be a tragic mistake would be for the US to continue its antagonistic policies, thereby heightening insecurities and precipating totalitarian measures as the leadership bids for survival.

(1.2) ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE

Given the world recession, falling prices for its traditional exports (bananas, cocoa, nutmeg, and mace), high domestic rates of inflation (12%) and unemployment (40%), and economic subversion by the US, Grenada has fared remarkably well in the economic sphere since the revolution. The "Report on the National Economy for 1981 and Prospects for 1982" indicated that real gross domestic products increased by two percent in 1981. The main economic focus of the Grenadian Government as revealed in the document is reconstruction of the economy, namely the rehabilitation of the basic infrastructure and the stimulation of the agricultural sector.

In this regard, domestic investment has increased dramatically in 1980 and 1981; the respective increases in capital outlays were 34.1% and 68.3%. Major products included the construction of an international airport, resurfacing of the air strip on Carriacou, a sister island, repairs on roads, schools, and some 973 homes of low income people, as well as the purchase of a transport ship. Unfortunately, private sector investment has fallen from $2.7 million in 1980 to $2 million in 1981.

In addition to the impressive upswing in the construction sector (14.5%), the PRG has sought to expand agricultural output, diversify crops, and increase agricultural employment. The agricultural, forestry, and fisheries sector accounts for 30% of the gross domestic product and 40% of the active work force, some 12,000 workers, making it the premier sphere of economic activity.

With the construction of an agro-processing plant, increased credit to farmers, and the acquisition of modern fishing trawlers, foreign exchange earnings increased despite lower prices for traditional cash crops. In an effort to conserve foreign exchange and foster greater self-reliance, food crops are being actively encouraged. In 1981, production of vegetables and starches went up 10%. Certain harvests, such as lettuce were so large that the surplus was exported. Plans are under way to market locally produced coffee and cocoa powder in another attempt to strengthen the domestic economy and replace extensive imports.

Machinery breakdowns and deficits in foreign trade and the domestic budget are the main problem areas. Like most Third World countries the terms of trade have continued to deteriorate. While export prices fell 13%, import prices rose 12% in 1981. Food and oil import bills were particularly large ($30 million) in that year. The deficit in 1981 was $40.2 million, up from $33 million in 1980. Government expenditures continue to outstrip its revenue. In 1981, the recurrent account deficit was $6.7 million. In an effort to balance the budget for 1982, expenditures have been cut back and taxes raised. Some of the proposed taxes include a 10% duty on imported soft drinks, 10% tax on imported fruits, jellies, and jams, 15% on imported clothes from outside CARICOM, 5% on alcoholic beverages, 1% on cigarettes, and a 5% increase to 55% in the standard company tax.

The area of the economy faltering the most is the tourist industry. In 1981, the hotel and restaurant business showed a 20% decline in earnings. The main reasons for the fall in arrivals and revenue are the deep recessions in North America and Europe--prime tourist markets, inconvenient air connections, negative publicity, and a fire that destroyed a third of the first class hotel rooms on the island. This is the sector that is mostly owned and operated by expatriates. Since the revolution, this class of people have been skeptical of the government's intentions and programs. Prime Minister Bishop and other members of the Cabinet have repeatedly stated their commitment to a mixed economy model and have initiated a number of meetings with businessmen in order to restore confidence. Presently, a study is being conducted as to how to best attract more tourists on the condition that steps be taken to protect indigenous cultural values and norms.

US-GRENADA RELATIONS

Although Grenada is a tiny island whose government is seriously commited to egalitarian development and many of the same democratic principles cherished by Americans, the previous and present US Administration in attempts to reassert American dominance in the region have singled out Grenada for hostile treatment. Concerned more about the spread of Cuban influence, the US Government has refused to respect the basic integrity and legitimacy of the Grenadian revolution. The Grenadian peoples' right to self-determination has been erroneously subordinated to East-West geopolitical considerations in the minds of US policymakers. Despite the setback in Vietnam, US leaders still believe that they can impose our model of political economy on others or at the very least exert appreciable control over the process of change in the Third World so as to serve selfish ends. Grenada is emerging as yet another futile exercise in "global policing".

Shortly after the popular overthrow of pro-American Eric Gairy, the US Government rejected an appeal for bilateral assistance by the revolutionary government and Frank Ortiz, the US Ambassador to the Eastern Caribbean, sent a message to the PRG stating that the US would view with "displeasures any acceptance of Cuban aid". Thereafter, the Ambassador made a small discretionary grant of $5,000. In contrast to the US niggardly actions, other countries including allies and socialist states have been quite generous. For instance, Cuba has offered 100 pieces of heavy machinery for the construction of the airport; 250 technicians, 13 medical doctors and dentists; seven fishing trawlers, and numerous university scholarships. Venezuela, a US ally, has extended a $3 million line of credit; technical assistance; aid to construct storage facilities, and a years supply of fuel for the machinery used to construct the airport. Guyana has provided over 1,000 metric tons of sugar at subsidized rates. Tanzania, Zambia, and Kenya offered quite a number of university scholarships. Several countries have extended grants and loans totalling some $45 million among them Iraq, Libya, Algeria, Syria, and the European Economic Community through its Development Fund.

In 1980, after heavy torrential rains and extensive flood damage, USAID attempted to block relief assistance from the Organization of American States Emergency Fund (FONDEM). After a delegation made an investigatory trip, $50,000 was extended to Grenada. Earlier at the insistence of the US, the Windward Islands Banana Grower's Association (WINBAN) which includes Dominica, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenada excluded the Grenadian Government from a US grant for the rehabilitation of banana trees damaged during a hurricane.

However, what was petty harassment under the Carter Administration escalated into full fledge economic warfare under Reagan. The new administration very openly tried to dissuade both attendance and pledges at an EEC co-financing conference for Grenada's international airport on April 14-15, 1981 in Brussels. The US argued that the airport would accomodate Cuban military aircraft and be used as a forward base to possibly disrupt the US supply routes in the Eastern Caribbean. US diplomats casted Grenada as a Soviet stooge and a Cuban staging area. One month earlier, the US Deputy Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund (IMF) successfully opposed Grenada's application for $6.3 million in Special Drawing Rights to be used for basic capital improvements. The US was also successful in influencing the World Bank to withhold the endorsement of Grenada's public investment program, thus blocking access to a previously negotiated $3 million concessional loan from the International Development Association. The lack of endorsement also taints Grenada's reputation with commercial international banks and other lending agencies, drying up more funds for Grenada's economic recovery.

In June of last year, the US offered $4 million to the Caribbean Development Bank on the condition that no money goes to Grenada. The Bank refused to accept the grant since the conditionality violated the charter of the multilateral bank. Later in the summer, US military forces conducted exercises calling for the invasion of the "Amber and Amberines", a leftist country in the Caribbean that had seized American residents. The scenario unsettled the people of Grenada and the Grenadines.

More recently, the administration has excluded Grenada along with Cuba and Nicaragua from the Caribbean Basin Aid Initiative. In an April 18, 1982 press conference in Barbados, President Reagan assailed Grenada for a "lack of democracy" and for intending to "spread the virus of Marxism among its neighbors".

The Grenadian Government, on the other hand, has made repeated attempts to open a dialogue with both administration via letters and envoys. The US has reacted by snubbing Grenada. The credentials of two different ambassadors have not been accepted, an invitation to the resident US ambassaodr in Barbados to visit Grenada goes unanswered, and only the second letter to Prime Minister Maurice Bishop to President Reagan calling for talks earned a one paragraph, noncommital reply. Moreover, the Grenda Government has on a number of occasions pledged itself to good neighborly relations and peaceful coexistence. To date there are no indications of attempts to subvert nearby states or significant militarization. In light of the serious commitment to the fulfillment of basic human needs and sound economic reconstruction by the Grenadian Government, the aggressive US actions seem totally unreasonable and unjustified. The concerted isolation and destabilization of a small country government seeking to improve the material well-being of its peoples seems contrary to US State Department and USAID objectives. Many other countries with corrupt leaderships and atrocious human right records have not been publicly chided by the US Administration let alone undermined. The US should be trying to strengthen the emerging democratic institutions and shore up the economy in Grenada instead of increasing financial hardship and psychological insecurities as do the current policies.

The days of "Yankee intervention" (1898-1965) in Central America and the Caribbean when the US could either surreptiously manipulate local politics or forcibly install pro-capitalist, pro-American lackeys when the desire was felt are long gone. In this era of political and economic nationalism, the Caribbean cannot be seen as a backyard. It must be seen as an area where some 26 million people live and harbor legitimate needs and aspirations for a better life. It is not for the US. Britian, France, or any other external power to usurp the task of charting the lines of political and economic revolution for these Caribbean states or any other nation in the Third World. The task lies with the indigenous people.

The people of Grenada are demonstrating in a remarkable way their sophistication and pragmatism. Westminister-style government has failed for them and doctrinaire Soviet-style Marxism has not been adopted. They are slowly fashioning open and democratic structures almost by trial and error. It is a bold experiment. The Reagan Administration would like us to believe that what is emerging in Grenada is a perversity.

We vehemently disagree and ask members of Congress to look at the record and judge for themselves. The challenges of social justice and economic development in the Third World do not lend themselves neatly to models developed in the more industrial countries. These less developed countries must be allowed to explore their own paths.

We propose that a superior US foreign policy stance would be predicated on ideological pluralism, constructive dialogues, a genuine commitment to adddressing global economic and environmental problems. The current heavy handed attempts to control the direction and pace of change, tends to alienate the US from progressive, reformist forces and reaffirms the imperialist image. US long term political and economic interests would be better served by respecting the right to self-determination and actively encouraging equitable economic development. Too often the US Government is tied to perpetuating exploitative arrangements in the Third World.

We would specifically suggest the following changes in US-Grenada relations:

(1) a cessation in US instigated hostilities toward Grenada in both the economic and diplomatic spheres:

(2) immediate undertaking of high level talks between the two governments as the first step in new full and cordial diplomatic relations;

(3) inclusion of Grenada in the Caribbean Basin Initiative and the extension of substantial bilateral economic assistance as a gesture of reconciliation and commitment to economic development; and

(4) cooperation in the extradiction of Eric Gairy, the former Prime Minister.

In light of the strong ideological convictions of the present administration, we would encourage this committee and other members of Congress after a formal communication of recommended changes in US-Grenada policy, to seek independent remedies such as explicit inclusion of Grenada in the Caribeean Basin Initiative and the earmarking of bilateral assistance funds.

Thank you.

IMPROVED UNITED STATES-GRENADA RELATIONS

Mr. **Barnes**. Let me ask you both to respond to Ambassador Bosworth's point that the United States doesn't really think that Grenada is serious about wanting better relations. They talk about it, they send letters, but they are not really serious. They haven't done anything substantive to indicate a desire for a better relationship with the United States. What is your judgment on that?

Mr. **Robinson**. I think that the area in which the United States, of course, has no right to intrude upon is the prerogative of independence of the Government of Grenada. Certainly the Grenadian people, if self-determination means anything, have the right to organize their economy and their political system in a fashion that they see fit. Otherwise, I think they have leaned over backward to make overtures to the United States.

I frankly cannot understand a U.S. policy that defends discussions with the South Africans, and warm and furthered relations with Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Paraguay, Haiti, and some of the most repressive regimes in the world and in the hemisphere, while at the same time turning our backs on these public/private overtures, from the Grenadian Government.

Mr. **Barnes**. Ambassador Shelton?

Ms. **Shelton**. Mr. Chairman, in view of the sustained hostile, anti-United States rhetoric over the last 3 years, I must admit that I am a bit skeptical about the sincerity of the Grenadian Government's professed desire for good relations but, as I indicated in my testimony, I think we ought to take them up on it. You have a lot to gain by talking with people, and a lot to lose by not talking with them.

GRENADA AS A SECURITY THREAT

Mr. **Barnes**. I gather neither of you think that Grenada constitutes a security threat to the United States. What about to its neighbors, is there any legitimate concern about security threat to any of its neighbors?

Ms. **Shelton**. There are two kinds of views in the eastern Caribbean about Grenada, Mr. Chairman. There is, indeed, some concern on the part of neighboring countries about allegations that Grenada is training West Indians in terrorist activities. I have never seen any convincing evidence of those activities, but there is concern.

On the other hand, Grenada is playing what a number of other heads of government have described to me as a positive and constructive role in regional organizations. There is, I would say, a general concern on the part of the eastern Caribbean, including Barbados, that Grenada not be isolated, indeed that it be knit more intimately back into the Caribbean family of nations.

Mr. **Barnes**. I will recognize the gentleman from New York.

Mr. **Gilman**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PARTICIPATORY GOVERNMENT

You talk about progress in this participatory type of government. Where is that progress?

We talked about suppression of the press. There has been no election down there. There are the political prisoners. Where have they made the progress in this participatory type of government?

Mr. **Robinson**. In setting up a system of the parish and the zonal councils, I think they have made a good deal of progress. In the last 3 years, they have opened up the system to some large degree of popular participation.

It may not well be the kind of democracy that we have come to know in the United States, but what I am suggesting is that I would hope that U.S. relations with countries around the world will not rest solely on that country's willingness to design a system that is completely identical to this one, if we are suggesting that they must have a Republican and a Democratic Party, and a constitution that matches ours.

Mr. **Gilman**. I am not suggesting that. But you are talking about a participatory type of government.

Mr. **Robinson**. I am suggesting that they feel strongly that theirs allows more participation than ours. I am simply saying that they certainly, under any principle of self-determination, have as much right to put forth that as an idea, as a model for their government.

Mr. **Gilman**. Ambassador Shelton, do you agree that there has been some progress made since the overthrow of the government?

Ms. **Shelton**. I am not convinced of progress in the political arena, Congressman. I do believe there has been progress in the social and economic areas as I indicated in my testimony. I guess I am just a convinced Democrat. I believe in a multiparty democratic system. I believe that is the most effective way of articulating the will of the people.

Obviously, there are many countries in the Third World which have one-party states. There are some in this hemisphere, as I have suggested. There is one very, very close to us geographically, which is, for all practical purposes, a one-party state.

In these cases, I think what we should be looking for is the level of tolerance of one-party governments, that to me is the most essential feature. I think that we can have good relations with a one-party state as long as some tolerance for dissenting opinions is allowed.

I think the jury is still out on the political situation in Grenada, as I have suggested. It is obviously still evolving. I think that it is a bit too soon to jump to any conclusions about what will or will not happen in Grenada.

Mr. **Robinson**. May I add one point to my answer.

Mr. **Gilman**. Please.

Mr. **Robinson**. I think were we to have as a sole criterion for U.S. good relations with governments that they have multiparty democracies, we would have relations with perhaps fewer than a fourth or fifth or sixth of the members states of the United Nations.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

One further point. I am not sure that the testimony that has been given by all on the quashing of the freedom of the press is quite accurate. My information is that the Free West Indian newspaper still operates with a circulation of about 8,000, and that it is an independent newspaper. That, of course, needs to be pursued and checked, but I don't think that free press has been fully abolished in Grenada.

Mr. **Gilman**. Do you agree with that statement, Ambassador Shelton?

Ms. **Shelton**. Congressman, I don't know precisely who owns and prints the Free West Indian, but I have read it very carefully ever since it was first founded, and I have never seen anything in the Free West Indian other than the official government line. So my inclination would be to doubt that it is indeed a free, independent newspaper.

ANTI-UNITED STATES RHETORIC

Mr. **Gilman**. Mr. Robinson, you indicate that there is a serious desire by Grenada to be a friend of the United States, or at least to have a dialog with the United States. If that is the case, why is there so much anti-United States propaganda that comes from the Government of Grenada?

Mr. **Robinson**. We have an island state that is 10 miles by 20 miles, with 100,000 people, not all that terribly far from the most powerful country in the world, that effected a revolution against a corrupt and vicious regime. It looked immediately to the United States for support and got a slap in the face.

They were really pushed into the Cuban arms for assistance in a way they don't necessarily want to be in a singular fashion. They have gotten not the kind of response from the United States that one would think a freedom-loving democracy, and the most powerful nation in this hemisphere would give.

They feel very put upon. They genuinely believe that the United States has sought to isolate, strangulate, and subvert their revolution. One would easily understand why there would be hostility in Grenada toward the United States.

They are no threat to us, but we, indeed, in their perception, are a continuing threat to them.

Mr. **Gilman**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know our time is limited, and I thank the witnesses.

Mr. **Barnes**. I thank the gentleman.

I want to thank both of you for your testimony and your help this afternoon.

The subcommittee stands in recess.

[Whereupon, at 4:22 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned.]

BLANK PAGE

APPENDIX 1

LETTER TO SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BARNES FROM REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM F. GOODLING RELATING COMMENTS OF A CONSTITUENT ON GRENADA

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. MICHAEL D. BARNES,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I recently received a letter on the subject of Grenada from a close friend and former constituent of mine. I would like to relate to you some of his comments.

This gentleman has had considerable experience in Grenada and indicated to me his high regard and warm feelings for the Grenadian people. He maintains a number of contacts in Grenada and described a growing level of popular discontent there, contrary to some media reports. My friend believes that the government is not representative of the Grenadian people and that its growing militancy and close relationship with Cuba and the Soviet Union are cause for serious concern.

In view of the Subcommittee's recent interest in Grenada, I think it is important that I share with you these concerns.

With best wishes, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. GOODLING,
Member of Congress.

APPENDIX 2

LETTER AND STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF BLACK LAWYERS

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF BLACK LAWYERS,
New York, N.Y., June 15, 1982.

Congressman MICHAEL D. BARNES,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The National Conference of Black Lawyers wishes to have the following statement entered into the record of the hearing on U.S. relations with the Government of Grenada.

The National Conference of Black Lawyers (NCBL), an organization of over 1,000 black lawyers and judges throughout the United States, Canada and the Virgin Islands, is committed to utilizing its skills and expertise in the struggle against racism, exploitation, oppression and other factors which militate against the attainment of human rights both at home and abroad.

Since the present government of Grenada came to power in March 1979, there have been a number of steps taken to improve the quality of life for the majority of the people of Grenada. Within the space of three short years, a new secondary school has been established, tuition fees have been eliminated, health care is free, and a nutrition program provides free milk to families with children to just mention a few things.

Over the last two years, NCBL has sent several delegations to Grenada that have had an opportunity to observe first-hand the process of social transformation underway. Even though Grenada is a poor country and underdeveloped from a technological standpoint, nevertheless, our members state that significant strides have been made in the areas of health, education and political participation. Discussions with various sectors of the Grenadian population revealed genuine support and a sense of pride in the achievements being made by the present government under the leadership of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop.

Although numerous requests have been made first to the Carter Administration and now the Reagan Administration for normal relations between two sovereign states, those requests have been ignored. Instead, there have been a series of efforts to interfere in the internal affairs of Grenada by attempting to cut off international support for developmental projects underway in that country such as the international airport. Additionally, there have been increased military maneuvers in the Caribbean which totally disregard the international call declaring the Caribbean area as a zone of peace.

NCBL notes with a sense of irony efforts by the U.S. Government to justify its position regarding Grenada on the ground that Grenada is undemocratic because of its failure to hold elections while at the same time no firm stand has been taken against efforts in this country to disenfranchise black and other minority communities through a dilution of the Voting Rights Act.

We of the National Conference of Black Lawyers are of the view that it is incumbent upon the present U.S. administration to begin to have discussions with the Government of Grenada and work towards the establishment of normal relations which respects Grenada's right to national sovereignty and self-determination.

Sincerely,

DEBORAH A. JACKSON,
Cochair, International Affairs Task Force.

○